













The state of the  
Turf

1877

*Sdas.*  
Librarian

**Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library**  
**Govt. of West Bengal**



in view, were of course the separation of the urban and rural elements in the new county districts, and some sort of provision for the representation of important minorities in large constituencies, which should not incur the terrible imputation of sinning against the divine right of a majority. These were actually all the objects, so far as we can see, on which the Conservative leaders thought it worth their while to lay stress. The scandalously excessive representation of Ireland, and even the undue advantages accruing to their opponents from the undisturbed anomalies which continue to characterize the representation of Wales, these seem to them to have been trifles light as air. But they appear to regard with complacency the success of their efforts with respect to their two main contentions.

Now what does this success amount to? There is no provision in the Bill defining any limits by which urban and rural populations are to be separated, unless the schedule determining the extended boundaries of some score or so of the larger boroughs may be taken to satisfy this description. But there is a paragraph in the instructions of the Boundary Commissioners on which stress is likely to be laid both by Conservative and Radical critics. And there is no doubt that if the powers of these gentlemen were such as would enable them to comply with the instructions given them, some possibility would exist of something being done in this direction. But the resolution of the Government to exclude from the scope of the Boundary Commission all and any questions relating to the limits of existing boroughs must render it powerless to give any effect whatever to this instruction, except under very peculiar and special circumstances. Take Bedfordshire, for example, the first of the English counties in alphabetical order. It contains two towns, Luton with about 24,000, and Bedford with about 16,000 inhabitants. Bedford, although losing a member, is still to enjoy the privilege of returning Mr. Whitbread to Parliament; and the county is to be divided into two single-member divisions. If the Commissioners had power to recommend the coupling together of Luton with Bedford, thereby creating a borough constituency still falling short of the electoral quota entitled to return a member, a real separation would be effected between the urban and rural elements in this county. But as they are constrained to keep Luton outside the boundaries of the little Parliamentary Eden consecrated to the sole enjoyment of the Whigs, the larger town must necessarily form part of one or other of the county divisions, in which it cannot fail to exercise a prevailing influence. It may be the case, that in some of the mining and manufacturing counties the Commissioners will be able to devise circumscriptions which shall embrace populous districts, while excluding more sparsely inhabited regions adjacent; examples of this may be found in Monmouthshire and perhaps in North-East Lancashire. But in the

absence of any power to group together second and third-class towns situated in the same county or neighbourhood, though not immediately contiguous, this promising paragraph is little better than a delusion and a snare.

There remains the crowning triumph of Conservative diplomacy, which constitutes, indeed, the main feature of the joint Bill—the subdivision of all the larger constituencies into wards, boroughs, or districts, returning each a single member. The first indication of the impression produced by this very remarkable project was to be found in the shrill utterances of disavowal emitted by the press which speaks the mind of provincial Liberalism. Next came its condemnation by those who might have been expected to regard it with more favour—the advocates of proportional representation. More slowly follows the almost inarticulate grumbling of Conservative county members, who abhor a change which seems calculated at the same time to augment the responsibilities and to impair the dignity of their position. Mr. Schnadhorst unfortunately felt himself obliged to quit this country before he could find a convenient opportunity for publishing to the world his own sentiments upon this topic, but there can be little doubt that any proposal intended to afford a hearing to any persons not included in the majority for the time being can scarcely be palatable to the Caucus. By most of the local wire-pullers who, while not accepting the title, endeavour to perform the functions of this valuable institution in the interests of the Conservative party, undisguised dissatisfaction is almost universally expressed. Lord Salisbury in all probability was hardly aware of the extreme Conservatism which distinguishes even Radical politicians in this country, when an innovation threatening any institution or practice which they find on the whole convenient in the interests of their party is proposed by others. He must, indeed, have counted upon the vigorous resistance of the Whigs, whose political importance has for years been mainly due to that system of two-membered constituencies which has enabled a small faction, holding in most country towns the balance between Conservatives and Radicals, to make terms with either party, and so secure for itself a moiety of the representation. But he ought also to have realised more fully than he would seem to have done the bitter dislike with which Conservative members of Parliament would be sure to regard a reform which, although designed to promote the interests of their party, was foreign to the habits, offensive to the predilections, and inimical to the comfort of the individuals immediately concerned.

It can therefore scarcely admit of a doubt that this proposal, if made upon his own undivided responsibility by the leader of either party, would fail to conciliate, not only the approval of the House of Commons, but even the support of his own political adherents. And

yet so strange and exceptional has been the action of the political forces at work in the determination of this controversy—it is probably destined to become law. It is no small compliment to the constructive genius of Lord Randolph Churchill, that the leaders of both the great political parties should, during his absence, and in the teeth of almost general disapprobation, be emulously bent upon doing his bidding. The member for Woodstock, it need scarcely be said, has no particular sympathy with that particular type of Conservatism (not at all exclusively confined within the ranks of the Conservative party) which values an institution or a thing simply because it has become accustomed to it. And he has been quite shrewd enough to see that a readjustment of our electoral areas which may be expected to give to the Conservative party at least one-third of the representation of the metropolis—while almost certain to shift completely the centre of political gravity within the party itself—must also tend considerably to augment the authority of the Conservative party of the future in its appeals to a dominant democracy. If the Boundary Commissioners bring to their task one half of the skill and anything like the impartiality for which credit has been claimed on their behalf, it is not easy to believe that the subdivisions of Birmingham and Manchester, of Leeds and Sheffield, will not reproduce in their new electoral wards the same characteristics as may be expected to distinguish St. George's, Hanover Square, from Mile End Old Town, and Kensington from Rotherhithe.

When time enough has gone by to enable us to survey without passion or prejudice the extraordinary incidents which have signalized Mr. Gladstone's Reform campaign, it may probably come to be admitted that Lord Salisbury has done the best he could to lay the foundations of a new Organization which might take the place of that Conservative Party which came into existence upon the ruins of ancient Toryism under the inspiration of Sir Robert Peel. Naturally enough, this combination has been largely influenced by the idiosyncrasy of its original founder; but it has never comprehended or, at any rate, sympathized with his political genius. Conservative in his social and administrative views, that statesman was, as all the world knows, of a very different school in fiscal matters. Although he led the landed interest, he was not of it; nor did it occur to him as it did to his successor, Mr. Disraeli, to study and humour the foibles of his party, in order to become its master. Sir Robert Peel had no ambition to hold power as the Barber-Surgeon of the English Squirearchy. But he had, in common with his followers, that sterility of mind so often and so strangely associated in English statesmen with great administrative capacity and parliamentary eloquence of the highest order, which too frequently commits a party leader to a policy of resistance which he knows to be hopeless, and which he, therefore,



sustains in a feeble and half-hearted manner, that conduces as much as any other cause to the defect which he has inwardly prognosticated. And if this has been the characteristic of more than one of their leaders, it has been so even in a greater degree of the rank and file of Conservatism. Always to go into battle secretly convinced that the best thing they can hope for is not to lose everything which they have got, they have served throughout the half-century of their existence less as a bulwark against Radical attack than as an incentive to Radical cupidity. So it has come to pass that, on the rare occasions when they have commanded the majority of the House of Commons, they have been utterly unable to discover what to do with it, beyond ransacking the pigeon-holes of their predecessors for some of the less objectionable measures which they had omitted to pass. No wonder that their legislation has been perfunctory and ineffectual.

“ *Cervi luporum præda, rapacium  
Sectamur ultro quos opimus  
Fallere et effugere est triumphus.* ”

It was his determination to disregard this instinct of his followers which constituted Lord Beaconsfield's greatness as a statesman and his weakness as a party leader. Sir Robert Peel had sinned against their principles and their interest; so they cast him out. But this ostracism was not accomplished until he had largely infected them with that political disease which his apologists term caution, and its enemies cowardice. They knew their prejudices would have to be sacrificed some day, and that they were not really prepared to fight for them; but none the less did they decline to travel without them, or to execute any manœuvre which should involve a voluntary abandonment of anything to which they had grown accustomed. And there can be little doubt at the present moment that a great many if not most of the Conservative members in the House of Commons would actually prefer no Redistribution Bill at all, or the Draft Bill of the *Standard*, to the revolutionary measure which Lord Salisbury has forced on Mr. Gladstone, with the intention rather of reconstructing than of preserving the party which he leads.

At the present moment it is less interesting to forecast the immediate consequences of the joint scheme of reform than to speculate with regard to its ulterior effects upon the evolution of the Tory Party. What manner of men are these new Tories to be? and to whom will they look for light and leading? Lord Salisbury's *magnum opus* has probably been that *Paradise Lost* which at present engages our attention. It will be by the merits and results of this performance that he will take his place in history. Whatever part may be his in the legislation of the next ten or twenty years, he can hardly expect by any subsequent achievement again so completely to transform the state of England; and the accident of birth which

excludes him from the House of Commons, at least so long as the Peers retain their privileges, necessarily removes him from the sphere of actual warfare. Immense as is his superiority to all his colleagues, and powerful as must be his influence in their councils, he must be content to occupy a position not greatly dissimilar to that of Bolingbroke under George II., and to leave to the Pulteneys and Chesterfields of our own day the active championship and representation of the party. Where are we to look, outside the Liberal ranks, for politicians even of this calibre? There have been not a few who in the ever-increasing divergence between the opinions of Mr. Goschen and the views of his former associates have been prone to anticipate the adhesion of the member for Ripon to the party whose principles, except in the matter of local taxation, are really identical with his own. But such vaticinations fail to estimate duly the peculiar fibre of Mr. Goschen's idiosyncrasy. Heartily as he detests Liberal measures, even more cordially does he abhor Tory men. Sincerely as he dislikes and distrusts such legislation as the Franchise Bill, it is with infinitely greater bitterness that he has already criticized, and is evidently prepared further to criticize, those provisions of the redistribution scheme which he is inclined to attribute to the Conservative leaders. Anxious, presumably, to secure that representation of minorities to which he has owed his political existence, he has not been slow to condemn what appears the only practicable proposal for perpetuating it, in language which, if it had any significance beyond that of a splenetic egotism, would imply his preference for election by *scrutin de liste* to the subdivision of large constituencies. It seems scarcely probable that Mr. Goschen can ever again sit in a Liberal Cabinet; but there is even less likelihood of his ever finding a resting-place in the Conservative camp, unless he should find it deserted by all its former occupants, as the outcasts from Samaria hold high festival in the tents of Ben-Hadad. It is not of such stuff as this that the leaders of the new Toryism will be composed, and it is only grievous to see a statesman, second only to Mr. Gladstone in ability and administrative capacity, so separated from one party by his principles, and from the other by his suspicions, as to tend day by day still further to degenerate into nothing better than the rogue elephant of the House of Commons.

If the Tory party of the future is merely to reproduce the essential characteristics of the Conservatism with which we are familiar, it is obvious that the minority in the next House of Commons would tend to form a new combination around the representatives of a Liberalism suspected of comparative moderation, such as Lord Hartington and Sir William Harcourt. And it is likely enough that some of Mr. Chamberlain's colleagues are already reckoning upon the support which they may receive from gentlemen opposite in thwarting the

projects of their ambitious associate. But, however stormy may be the horoscope of the political combination with which he has identified himself, Lord Hartington has no more intention of quitting the Liberal party than had his affectionate spouse of deserting Mr. Micawber. And Sir William Harcourt? Why the devotion of Ruth to Naomi was as nothing to that which Sir William Harcourt entertains for the future Duke of Devonshire. Wherever he goes there will the present Home Secretary be found; in whatever Cabinet he lodges there will appear the name of that humble scion of a noble house; and the virtual apotheosis of the member for Derby will have been reached if he may be fortunate enough to find his last resting place in the tomb of the Cavendishes.

But if our future Tories are to be cast in a somewhat different mould from their immediate predecessors; if for the gentle hesitancy of Northcote is to be substituted a spirit more akin to the inflexible genius of Pitt; if in lieu of the prudence of Peel there should revive something of the audacity of St. John and Wyndham; if they will condescend to become popular, not indeed by pandering to the passing delusions of the mob, but by a constant appeal to that truly national sentiment which has not even yet ceased to animate a majority of the English people—a party thus regenerated will hardly lack leaders, albeit of a type perhaps not very familiar to the present generation.

The mere fact that any such new departure in politics should have become imminent, and that the old Tory party should suddenly be called upon to choose whether it will prefer to dwindle into a pitiable faction or to undergo a process of development which may make those dry bones live again, this at least may be held to sustain our original thesis, and to warrant the analogy drawn from the parallelogram of forces. When Mr. Gladstone introduced the Franchise Bill, nay, even when he invited the Conservative leaders to meet him in Downing Street, he could scarcely have intended to contribute to the formation of a hostile party as popular in its methods and sympathies as his own, but prepared to rally their countrymen rather to the cause of national greatness than of class interest; nor in all probability did Lord Salisbury, when he told his followers to insist upon the inclusion of redistribution in the Franchise Bill, altogether expect that before the year was out he would himself have to sign the political death-warrant of at least half his party. Just as the Conservative leaders shrank from any direct resistance to Mr. Gladstone's proposed franchise, so have the Government in their turn been afraid of opposing a scheme of redistribution infinitely more drastic than their own. The logic of the Opposition has probably been better, although the event has proved that their premises were unsound. By abstaining from any show of defence in his front, and trusting entirely to the effect to be produced by their operations on

his flank, they have suffered the Liberal leader to seize the position of advantage which he sought to secure. And though they may have succeeded in rolling round his right wing to a certain extent, the immediate consequence of their success in this manœuvre is only to embark them on a line of march, in the first instance probably neither foreseen nor desired, in conjunction with their late adversaries. They may claim, as some indeed rather faintly endeavour to assert, that they have carried their argument to a demonstration; and so they have, but a logical victory may be considered to have been rather dearly purchased by the holocaust of a party, at least in the opinion of the victims.

Some malcontents there are among the young Whigs as well as the old Tories, who think it worth while to try how far "the evident sense" on both sides of the House may be found effectual, as a means of defeating some vital provision in the Bill. The Whigs, to whom any scheme of redistribution must necessarily prove injurious, may possibly be not altogether misguided in seeking the rejection of the joint scheme. Ripon and Calne, Tavistock and Bodmin, are too precious to be sacrificed without at least an effort to preserve them. Yet even the Whigs would do well to consider how they would fare in a Parliament which continued to recognise the existence of those interesting little communities, but to which Manchester and Birmingham each sent seven, and Marylebone, Finsbury, Lambeth, and Tower Hamlets eight members apiece, the nominees of the majority by *Scrutin de Liste*. The Whig of modern times prolongs his useful career by trimming, or at least appearing to trim, the balance between the two real parties into which public opinion is divided. But when there is no balance to trim, the little make-weight can have no function reserved to it. And if for no other reason, it is desirable that the Tory party should continue to exist, if only to enable the Whigs to represent themselves as necessary to the Radicals. But it is much harder to see what Tory mutineers hope to gain if the Government should be defeated upon some vital point in the Bill. Would it be possible for Lord Salisbury to accept office upon the rejection by the House of Commons of some important clause on which he was pledged to act in accord with Mr. Gladstone? And if he did so, what could he do? Would it be feasible to go to the country with a programme of Redistribution materially falling short of that to which he had already become a party? And what help or countenance could be expected in such a case from the Ministerial contingent who will now support Lord Salisbury's part of the scheme, because it has been endorsed by their own chief? An appeal to the existing constituencies might indeed have proved the trump-card of the Conservative Opposition before the Franchise Bill had become law. But the Franchise Bill is law. The fer-

tilising stream or the overwhelming deluge, whichever it may prove to be, is already released from the barriers which have hitherto impeded it; and if we do not make haste to shape the channels and devise the outlets by which this tremendous force is to be regulated and adjusted, it will be down upon us unchecked and uncontrollable as sure as the sun rises on the first day of 1886. Or is it thought desirable that Mr. Goschen should form a Cabinet with Mr. Chaplin and Mr. Courtney as his henchmen, and a happy family of Irreconcilables from both sides below the gangway to constitute the Ministerial majority? Can there be found anywhere a more conspicuous example of the *Reductio ad absurdum* than this? And yet, such is the dilemma in which we all find ourselves, that there is really no way of escaping from it unless by some expedient thus extravagantly preposterous. We shall never know how far Mr. Gladstone would really have pressed his advantage, because his sincerity was never tested by open and outspoken opposition. We shall never know, at least if the joint Bill gets through the House of Commons, how far Lord Salisbury was in earnest in propounding the wholesale transformation of the constituencies. All we do know is that in consequence of their joint action we have set out upon a course which neither, as far as we can surmise, would have proposed, but which we may yet be permitted to hope may prove ultimately beneficial, since, as far as can at present be judged, it is universally unacceptable.

A CANDID CONSERVATIVE.

## THE EXPANSION OF ART.

AMONGST the many developments of civilisation in England during the nineteenth century, not the least remarkable is the expansion of art—art as a factor in life, art as an institution, art as a motive power. It may safely be said that, until a comparatively recent period, art had no direct bearing on the political economy or social condition of the English nation. Its conditions were those of a mystery, with its temples, its priests, and its votaries. It was confined to a limited sphere, and never identified with the pursuits of the people. Whether it progressed, declined, or remained stationary, art revolved within a charmed circle, apart from the moral or imperial interests of the Commonwealth. Indulged in as a luxury or a whim, by a select and exclusive caste—a mere accessory of their privileged existence—art revealed itself only in the palaces of the sovereign, the mansions of the nobles, and the edifices of the clergy. The masses were acquainted with it only in the ostentatious delineation of some great pageantry, or the pompous accompaniment of some great feast. On the Continent, on the other hand, art has ever been a chief element of civilisation, as well as one of the glories of ambition. Whether from climatic or geographical causes, or from natural qualifications, the peoples of the Continent inclined to art as the expression of their healthiest feelings and noblest impulses, and sought to render in song or in marble, to portray in colour or on the stage, inspirations which no less tended to incite, than they served to commemorate, the progress of their country. Thus, whilst the monasteries of the Continent were silently sending forth masterpieces, amidst the acclamation of reverential and entranced nations, or at a later date, when the Renaissance transfigured the face of the world with a new and wondrous beauty, the attention of the people of England was concentrated on widening their frontier, consolidating their liberties, and discovering their material resources.

Although it has been reserved for the nineteenth century to witness in England a spread and an advance of art, disproportionate almost in its rapidity to the varied growth of the country, collections of works of art have at all times existed in England. The sacristies abounded in artistic marvels, gathered together with spiritual devotion and enthusiastic zeal. In Westminster, Hampton Court, Windsor, and Whitehall, treasures that were less prized for their intrinsic value than for the quality of their execution, were accumulated by the wearers of the British Crown. Nor were Kenilworth, Burghley, Petworth, Knole, Longleat, and Hatfield, mere empty monuments of boastful splendour, or haughty embodiments of superior force. But still art sat as in a close borough, and even in the days of

Sir Peter Lely, Hogarth, and Sir Joshua Reynolds, Sir John Vanbrugh, Sir Christopher Wren, and Adams, art only lay at the command of the great and the wealthy, a mere curiosity to the public, to be wondered at, but not possessed. But if we glance at Italy, France, and Germany, we may find that a cottage was a thing of beauty, a vestment or doublet a harmonious composition, and the fashioning of a weapon the work of love. Whilst the decorative art of France adorned the surroundings of the humblest hearth with subtle or attractive elegance, and made even the meanest implement a fanciful and graceful conceit, and whilst from the sands of Brandenburg, no less than from the banks of the Seine, academies sent forth armies of pioneers to inculcate their refining notions in the minds and habits of the people, the services of transalpine artificers were invoked to beautify English halls and apartments. The decorative talent of the country still lay dormant within the ponderous four-poster, and its artistic genius found little scope beyond the workshop of the goldsmith.

Art first dawned on the masses in England at the end of the last century, when the political convulsions of, and the facilitated and increased intercourse with, the Continent itself brought the bulk of the people into a closer connexion with the various peoples of Europe and with the French in particular. The Revolution of 1789 scattered over England not only the cultured scions of the aristocracy, the polished princes of finance, and the skilled workmen of France, but priceless and countless works of art, the heirlooms of centuries. Then, both politically and artistically, the attention of England became more closely riveted on France. The generous reception accorded to the French refugees was extended to the pictures and furniture, the sculpture and gems, which had escaped the vandalism of a Republican mob. To a great extent the masterpieces of Versailles and the Tuileries, the galleries of Choiseul, of Calonne, of the Duke of Orleans, found their way into the safe keeping of English homes. Works of art revealed themselves suddenly in an unprecedented and plentiful manner. Art itself, following in their wake, invaded and settled permanently in the country. By the great dispersion of the collections of France, and the fruitful and accomplished labours of the French refugees, a widespread national taste for art was engendered, which rapidly laid its hold on the country. The very war between England and France induced Englishmen to cross the channel more frequently during intervals of peace, and carry off spoils whose possession was made doubly attractive from the rare occasions on which they could be secured. Most great movements and improvements which have affected the welfare and social economy of England, have originated with the people, and worked themselves upwards, thus enforcing a claim on patronage and legislation. The artistic movement, however, acquired its impulse from the higher ranges of

society, and has been conducted by them into a variety of channels, which have irrigated and fertilised the country. It was the dissemination of ancient and foreign works of art, the facility with which the multitude have been made conversant with their beauty and usefulness, that has opened out a new vista of refinement and industry, and made art a prominent factor in life, thus reversing its history on the Continent, for whereas on the Continent it was the natural disposition for art which begot works of art, in England it was the sight of, and familiarity with, works of art that transfused the artistic sentiment through the veins of the nation.

In 1842 the sale of the Strawberry Hill collection signalled the formation of numerous private collections as well as the increased accumulation of artistic valuables in public museums. The sale of the contents of Stowe Park in 1848, and of the Bernal collection in 1856, led to an importation, a migration, and shifting of pictures, of cabinets and china, to which the wanderings of the barbarians hardly offer a parallel. Works of art hardly ever seem destined to find a peaceful home or a permanent harbour of refuge, and, with the exception of those which have been acquired by museums, reached one abode only to pass into another. Whether disposed of by private contract or brought to the hammer, they wander from mansion to mansion, from county to county, inspiring unknown delights, instilling new aspirations, and suggesting the starting-point for hitherto unthought-of careers and professions. No doubt it is a matter of regret or condolence that occasion should arise when, to gratify a selfish desire for enhanced luxury or comfort, or to replenish an empty exchequer, owners are tempted or compelled to denude their walls of trophies which have been for years the pride of their family; but our feelings are soothed when we know that these trophies are destined to embellish the houses of appreciative collectors and patrons. Newly-formed collections are generally more accessible in their new homes than in their former secluded retreats. They contribute, not a little, to dignify their new residence; they attract the more enlightened and intelligent portions of society, who, in their turn, attract the fashionable throng. Thus brilliant gatherings are formed which have a beneficent influence on the tone and the conditions of society at large, and may lead to the social and political development of a future age. The more often works of art change hands the better they become known, and the more thoroughly and permanently they inculcate the taste for and knowledge of art, and assist in educating the people. And when they are absorbed into some public institution, which then becomes their *alma mater*, they act as a safeguard against mediocrity by affording a standard of excellence; they serve as inspiring models to the rising geniuses of the day, kindle generous impulses of imitation and emulation, cultivate and refine the masses, besides giving them a gratuitous lesson in history, natural



history, and geography. It is to be deplored that some of the art treasures which have been recently sold should be lost for ever to this country, but the loss is amply compensated by importations from foreign climes. It is but a fair retribution that the descendants of generations who have been continuously despoiled should recover what was originally due to the inventive mind of their forefathers.

It is a matter of legitimate pride that the emanations of English genius often wend their way across the channel and prove that even in the fogs of Great Britain Art can flourish and send forth some of its most enviable blossoms. Moreover, it is to the Continent that the English art student has chiefly looked, until now, for those unrivalled examples and models in which it still abounds; but if he is compelled to seek, under the glamour of an Italian sky, that breadth of treatment and brilliancy of colour from which he is debarred in the benighted atmosphere of these isles, or to acquire in the archæological preservation of a German city that finish of style and minuteness of detail which have long been effaced from the industrial and overcrowded centres of his own country, it is amongst the familiar surroundings of home, and in the heart-stirring tradition of his compatriots, that he will find the sweetest subjects of pathos and sentiment and the noblest inspirations. Though England hitherto has not been prolific in giving birth to the happiest artistic inventors or initiators, she has always been justly famed for according the most enlightened and munificent patronage to the artists of other nations and their works. If, until recently, England has depended on the Continent for artists, it may be said that nowhere do they meet with a readier welcome. Already in the days of Henry VIII. Holbein and Antonio Moro, in those of Charles I. Rubens and Vandyke, and in those of the Georges Vandewelde and Canaletto, found at the British court and on British soil a regal recognition of their merits. It was in England that Handel was raised to immortal fame, and for the English that he wrote the oratorios, which, more in England than in his own country, have been popularised, and whose sublime harmonies have wafted their echoes into the hearts of great multitudes. In more recent times Mendelssohn, and in our own days Gounod, met from an English public a response which considerably enhanced the celebrity of the former, and gained for the latter a more commanding position amongst his countrymen.

As soon as the people of England discovered a new field of enterprise, they set themselves to explore it with characteristic zeal and ardour. There came a general clamour for artists, a general charge and rush on works of art, which carried away every impediment and procured at any price that which it comparatively lacked—a taste for art. The consequence was that the centre of art became displaced from its long and continuous fixture on the Continent, and was firmly established in England. The anxiety to possess works of art, to emu-

late foreign collectors and ancient collections, and to found a national school of art, explains the fanciful prices which are paid for relics of the past as well as for modern productions. Figures which in former times would have been considered worthy the ransom of a king are now freely expended on a few inches of canvas; and, to strain the comparison still further, sums which are lavished on the acquisition of a pair of china vases might have formerly sufficed to ransom a great noble. It leads to unfavourable comment when a reckless plunge is made for the sake of a cabinet whose facsimile can be obtained at a comparatively trifling outlay; or for a set of crockery which the tender mercies of a housemaid's brush might reduce to worthless fragments. "The hungry workman staggers at what he considers wanton folly, and ponders over an unjust dispensation of Providence. Sums thus squandered would ensure comfort and affluence to scores of thrifty but needy families, who, at the risk of their lives, burrow in the bowels of the earth, or swelter in the heat of factories, for the benefit of some thoughtless Mæcenas. Would it not be wiser on the part of the nation to forego the possession of a statue or picture in order to reduce taxation or endow some charity? But the miner or the operative should keep in mind that the picture or the statue has become in a measure his own property, that he, as a unit of that great aggregate body which is termed the nation, has his own claim to its sight and share of its enjoyment, that, enabled to exchange the squalor of his environments for a refreshing stroll in those lordly galleries in which he has a vested right, he may procure for himself a happy diversion from his troubles and cares, and gain for his little ones a costless and easy access to representations of the many beauties of the world, and open their eyes and their minds to the varied examples of religion and nature in their most ideal form. As yet the great movement of opening Museums on Sundays has not met with success; but on holiday times or after working hours many an instinct that would otherwise satiate itself in a gin-shop, or relieve itself in domestic abuse, is turned into a healthier channel. Nor should the expenditure, when it is incurred by private individuals, be deemed profligate waste. Money thus freely spent is not thrown into the gutter; it is but a mutual exchange. Undoubtedly the seductive voice of the auctioneer, or the insinuating whisper of a broker, may lead the excited collector to overstep the boundaries of prudence, or make an injudicious investment; but surely the excitement produced at a sale is less baneful than that connected with the racecourse.

At all times there have been fanatics, who from vanity or ostentation fritter away their patrimony on worthless objects. As far back as the early days of George III., young men of position returned from the grand tour of the Continent with bad copies of Italian masters, which had been fastened on them as originals. The modern collector is only one of those many enthusiasts in whom the world abounds.

Shorthorns and yearlings give rise to fierce competition; rare orchids and postage-stamps are objects of extravagant research. Pessimistic prophets, following the example of their predecessors, croak that the curiosity mania has now reached the acme of folly; and that the collector will shortly awake from his dreams, to find that his beloved treasures are not only depreciated in value, but have sunk to their proper level. As yet there are no visible signs of a depreciation in the value of works of art. Although, on the whole, the market for unique art has been confined to Europe, the time may not be far distant when the Americans will appear, not as competitors, but as conquerors, in the field. What with the growth of their population, the rapid increase of their civilisation, and their desire to emulate the fashions of the Old World, as well as the propensities of the upper classes to rival and outvie each other, it is to be expected that they will not keep aloof from the auction-room, and escape what may be termed a universal rage. Already they have established their claims to the most liberal patronage of Modern Art. It is in the United States that the masterpieces of Corot, François Millet, Meissonnier, and the French School are chiefly to be found. Fortunately for England, its great manufacturers have enabled it to retain the masterpieces of its national school; but the day has already dawned when Royal Academicians are invited to send their productions across the Atlantic. Indeed, one of the most imaginative members of that body is engaged at this moment in painting replicas of his most esteemed works for exhibition on American soil. Already, too we lose—at least, during part of the year—most of the great ornaments of the stage, who find a more princely remuneration in the United States than at home. Fortunes are showered on our songsters and songstresses in one year, which it would take their lifetime in Europe to accumulate, to the despair and ruin of our theatrical managers. And who would grumble that the successors of a Reynolds, a Gainsborough, or Turner, should, in their lifetime, meet with their due reward? Is it a reason, that, because Cofregio suffered hunger and want, and because a Reynolds had to measure the value of his works according to their size, that we should now abstain from procuring their works at a price commensurate with their perfection; or because Schubert—to quote but one instance—disposed of his ballads for bare bread, that we should shrug our shoulders at the editor who purchases the copyright of a partition at its weight in gold? The fact is, money is the common standard by which an article is valued. High prices are not only the result of a whim or a fashion, or the criterion or ratification of a truer estimation of art, but one of the many results of the increased prosperity of the nation.

A trip round the world occasionally, on a well-appointed yacht, almost forms part of the elementary education of the aspiring politician; while the paterfamilias, who not many years ago deemed

the Trossachs or Boulogne the goal of his ambition, now airs his portly frame beneath the dome of St. Peter's or in the courts of the Alhambra. The tradesman who once was content to live over his warehouse or shop, luxuriates with his wife and daughters under the honeysuckled porch of a suburban villa; and matrons adorn their blooming offsprings in finery such as, in the earlier days of their conjugal life, they only donned on festive occasions. But the world is not merely becoming more prosperous; it is becoming more refined; and it will apply to the common usefulness of life the distinction which art generally gives. It would be a matter of indifference whether, and in what form, and to what extent, patronage is afforded to works of art, and to their purchase, were not this patronage to lead to a direct influence on the various pursuits of life with which art has become identified. How prominent a position art has attained, is proved by the deference and homage that are paid to artists. There may not be an Emperor at hand to pick up the brush of a Royal Academician; but the social distinctions with which the great painters, sculptors, musicians, and theatrical artists of the day are overwhelmed, the universal desire to assimilate them with the daily drift of one's life, is a proof of the estimation in which art is held. As yet these distinctions have not ripened into the substantial form which they have assumed on the Continent. The anniversary dinner of the Royal Academy, though an invitation from Art to Society, exemplifies by the quality of its guests the anxiety on the part of the leading representatives of the State to pay homage to art; but the homage is an inexpensive return for a hospitality so gracefully dispensed. Law and medicine are honoured by titles and distinctions. Literature has been recognised by a seat in the hereditary chamber. But Art—on the part of the State, in the persons of the artists themselves—still lingers in the shade. The day, however, may dawn when its professors will be amongst those whom the Sovereign will 'delight to honour.' If artists have become inseparable from Society, art has become inseparable from Civilisation. Art has been grafted on every branch of our life—invaDES our privacy, colours our actions, engrosses our occupations, pastimes, and amusements.

Who would deny that the introduction of art into gardening has been a chief agent in attracting an orderly and well-disposed crowd, and has been the best means of defeating nefarious temptations? and who would affirm that the artizans who throng the courts of the Crystal Palace to gaze at their plastic reproductions, as well as the classical grounds of Kensington, and the growing galleries of Bethnal Green, are merely withdrawn from their usual haunts by superficial curiosity or wanton idleness? Their numbers and earnestness bear witness to the fact that art has entered into their very existence. Many a latent impulse has been quickened into life at the sight of an ornamental carpet bed; many a dormant instinct has been aroused by

the sight of the models, the sculpture, the embroideries, and endless works of art, the existence of which otherwise would have been ignored. There seems a reciprocal understanding, a give and take, between art and the citizen of the world. The whitewashed wall of the humblest abode, is enlivened with prints, whose homely and sacred subjects, in return, incline their possessor to homeliness and piety; the sideboard of the housewife is adorned with china of a tasteful pattern or artistic shape. At once a desire is fostered for greater neatness and thrift. Books, artistically bound and studded with woodcuts, stimulate the youth to attain knowledge. Music has tended as much as the sister arts to humanize and elevate the mind. Indeed, better than an eloquent sermon, or the appeals of a persevering curate, the harmonies with which the domes of our halls are filled move the hearts of thousands of sceptics, and incline them to charity. The first notes of his flute or violin have charmed many a reprobate away from the 'gaffs' of his slum, and solaced the solitary gloom of many a forlorn hovel. Art, having been disseminated, has become popularised, and as it has grown into a factor in life, has necessarily claimed the attention of the nation and the Government. Thus incipient institutions have been enlarged, and new ones formed for the adoption of art as a motive power.

Although the birth of art in this country must be dated from a comparatively distant time, its dissemination amongst the people, its application to industry, and its development into a motive power, is as recent as the invention of the steam-engine or the discovery of the telegraph. Nevertheless, as the British Museum was founded in 1763, the establishment of art as an institution must be traced to that year. It was, however, only in the beginning of this century that the British Museum commenced to attain its present importance, owing; on the one hand, to the importation of the Elgin marbles in 1816, and, on the other, to the enlightened patronage of George IV., who bestowed on it, in the year 1823, the magnificent library of his father. To what extent art has developed into an institution can best be estimated from a comparison of the attendance and accommodation at the British Museum in its earlier days and at the present time. Take the Reading Room alone. Constructed to accommodate twenty persons, it was an event to see in it more than half-a-dozen students, whilst the galleries were almost as destitute of works of art as they were of visitors. In 1882 the British Museum was visited by 963,869 persons, of whom 12,719 utilised the Sculpture Galleries for the purpose of study, and 4,739 the Print Room with the same object, not to mention the vast numbers who frequented the libraries. The foundation of the Royal Academy of Arts a few years later than the British Museum, in 1769, was a further proof of the incipient taste and desire on the part of private individuals in the State to establish art as an institution. It would

be an unnecessary digression to enter into the history of the Royal Academy, with its various migrations, improvements, and growing importance. Its first exhibition was held in 1769, when 136 works of art were exhibited. Compare these numbers with those of the present day, when, in the summer exhibition of 1884, 8,093 works of art were sent in on approval, of which 1,856 found a place on the walls of Burlington House. There is no record of the number of visitors to the Academy in its young days, but the hold that art now has on the public can be gauged by the fact that in the four months during which the exhibition of 1884 was open it was visited by 312,511 persons.

But Art as an institution was established in its most inviting form on the part of the State, by the endowment of the National Gallery in 1823, when Sir George Beaumont patriotically placed his gallery of pictures at the disposal of his country on the condition that a national receptacle for them was provided. It was not till 1833, however, that the National Gallery was actually constituted by a Treasury minute. Transferred to its present site in 1838, it was visited in 1884 by 895,839 persons and 20,350 students, who were engaged in copying pictures, a further evidence of the recent growth in the importance of art in England. In France the "Salon" was already one of the chief attractions of the capital in the reigns of Louis XV. and XVI., and the contents of the Garde Meuble, the then equivalent to the galleries of the Louvre, was one of the leading sights of the city to which foreign potentates first hastened on their arrival. The tardiest recognition of the claims of one branch of art in this country is to be found in the recent formation of the Royal College of Music. Every European capital long had its Conservatoire, but it was only two years ago that a Royal Charter was obtained in England for the foundation of a kindred institution and the supplying of a long-felt want. It was only then that facilities were given to the nation to foster and develop the most legitimate of amusements and the most delightful of artistic accomplishments. *Poeta nascitur non fit*, but a musician, heaven-born though he may be, cannot achieve excellence without tuition. Were even the College of Music to fail in producing a Mozart or a Beethoven, it will materially assist in providing numbers of students not only with a healthy and a happy occupation, but also with the means of earning their livelihood.

The intention of the country to employ art as a motive power in the education and industry of the people was first shadowed forth in 1835. In that year a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to inquire into the whole subject of art-culture. The report of that body stated that "from the highest branches of practical design down to the lowest connexion between design and manufacture the arts had received little encouragement in this country." The first result of the inquiry was the establishment of Schools of Design. In 1835 there were only sixteen provincial Schools of Design in the whole of

Great Britain and Ireland, in which 3,000 pupils were under instruction; and a considerable portion of these had not passed the elementary stage. But it was not until 1851 that art became really an institution and an industry. This may be ascribed to the Great Exhibition, and the subsequent foundation of the South Kensington Museum, with its numerous branches, dependencies, and schools. It is not one of the lesser glories in the fame of the Prince Consort that, stimulated by the example of Continental nations in general, and France in particular, he recognised the advantages of art. In 1856 we already find, as a result of the inducements offered by the Science and Art Department for the formation of art-classes, the number of elementary art pupils in England and Wales increased from 29,000 to 50,000 in one year; and for an exhibition of works of art at South Kensington, 683 names were entered, of which 209 were students from 24 Schools of Art. The Exhibition of 1862, which was also due to the efforts of the Prince Consort, showed the increasing usefulness and influence of these schools by the fact that 104 of the manufacturers of china, porcelain, and woven fabrics of all kinds, employed 344 students from them as designers. In 1851, the date of the first Exhibition, 3,296 persons received instruction in art; in 1863 the number had bounded up to 90,000.

Further progress was made in 1864, when the Science and Art Department was incorporated under Royal Charter, and the prizes for successful study and the premiums to masters for results were augmented. At once the number of pupils rose to 110,000, 15,000 of whom were studying at Schools of Art; in 1873 the number reached 290,000, of whom 23,000 were art students; and in 1876 the figures were 530,000 and 27,000 respectively. In 1878 we find that there were 871 Art classes, exclusive of Art Schools, where 730,000 persons received instruction, of whom 30,000 were engaged in advanced stages. One of the direct results of this national training is exemplified in the fact that in 1879 upwards of 1,600 artists exhibited works in the five principal picture-galleries in London; and—showing more plainly the bearing of Art on the industries of the country—that at Nottingham, the chief centre of the lace manufacture, one of the largest firms which ten years ago paid £1,000 to £1,200 a year for French designs, now only pays £50 for such work; while in the same town one manufacturer pays as much as £5,000 a year to British designers. It is impossible to refrain from contrasting the expansion of Art with that of Science in the same period. Prior to 1853 the Science division of the Department of Science and Art already had an independent existence, and its energies were directed to establishing and multiplying local science schools. Nevertheless in 1883, whilst there were but 1,421 schools with 72,054 pupils under instruction in the science division, there were under instruction in Art 840,000, showing a preponderance of twelve to one in favour of

the latter. Furthermore, by reference to the last census, it will be found that whereas only 8,394 persons were returned as connected with science, 58,517 were registered under the name of artists, art painters, engravers, sculptors, music teachers, actors, artistic flower-makers, designers for workers in precious metals and jewellery, or in the manufacture of china, porcelain, and pottery. Nor must we forget the vast number of people who, though not artists themselves, are directly connected with art; the legion of tradesmen, artisans, journeymen, and workmen, who are dependent upon art industries for their livelihood. Take the frame-makers, gilders, binders, printers, paper-makers, and colourmen only, whose existence has sprung merely from one branch of art as an institution and an industry.

Exclusive of the Royal Academy there are at present fifty public art-galleries in London alone, with almost as many exhibitions. There are in addition ten clubs for the promotion of art-culture in the metropolis, while no considerable town throughout the country is without at least one such club; and there is a Printsellers' Association which must be regarded as connected with Art, as it stamped, in 1882, 57,702 proofs of engravings and etchings. Who would care to count the private studios which, though not included in official statistics, no less contribute their share to the expansion of Art? The importance of art as an institution, and its influence on the industries of the country, was long ago recognised in France on the part of the State by the creation of a Ministry of Fine Arts. Quite recently a Government inquiry was made by one of the former Ministers of the department, M. Proust, whose efforts are being followed at this moment by a more minute official investigation, such as in this country might be termed a Royal Commission, to determine the direct bearing of Art upon the industries of France. The preliminary report shows, first of all, to what an enormous extent the industries of France are benefited by the development of art, and secondly, how severely these have suffered from the spread of art culture in England. It would be presumptuous to entertain the hope that a similar special ministry will be formed out of the present complex Government of this country, though it might not be considered unnecessary, seeing that art has secured such a hold on the British public.

There is no need to dwell further on the assistance which art has rendered to industry. A stroll down Oxford Street into the City will afford more convincing evidence of the universal adaptation of art to the necessities as well as to the amenities of life than reports or statistics. But one is tempted to ask what will be the effect of a still further expansion of art both on the conditions of art itself and on the moral advancement of the nation. No doubt, the expansion of art depends on the increase, or at any rate on the maintenance, of the present population and wealth of the country. Despite the



depression of agriculture and of many branches of industry we can augur from the last Census and Budget no ominous decline in the political economy of the country. There has sprung up a considerable and prosperous middle class during this century which justly deems artistic refinement the inseparable reward of their labour and thrift. To the majority of that class the presence of art as an element in life has become as essential as the pursuit of those very industries to which they are indebted for the gratification of their new-found luxury. From the great manufacturers of the country modern art has received its most liberal, but not always its most enlightened, support. Many a self-made man, in the hurried desire to form a collection and to advertise his newly acquired riches on his walls, runs the risk of making purchases which would more appropriately be consigned to the lumber-room. His ostentatiousness is prone to shine in a florid ornamentation, to the prejudice of a subtler and more refined taste, whose purity and simplicity fail to satisfy him. Even the lower orders are steadily influencing the future condition of art. Education, in some form or degree, is being forced on them. On the one hand, they are enabled to apply a more mature but still imperfect understanding to the industries of art; on the other, art has to be lowered to the level of their capacities and requirements. There has appeared, in consequence, a distinct and novel class of art which rather appertains to the domain of mechanism, from the merits of its style and the rapidity of its reproduction. In such cases art drifts away from its parent stock, and in hollownss and superficiality, grows on a par with the sham gentility it is destined to cover. Chromo-lithography, galvano-plastic, oleography, have undoubtedly served to diffuse the knowledge of art; but art itself is degraded into merchandise, and the artist is tempted to produce compositions for the factory, instead of loftily expressing his sense of the ideal. Of the many recent inventions which have been applied to art photography is one of the most popular; and, though it has rendered inestimable services to science and industry, as well as conferred many boons on mankind, it has, perhaps, more than any other counterfeit of art, tended to damage true art. Photography offers Nature to copyists and imitators in a stiffened and conventional form, and from the cheapness of its acquirement relegates to obscurity the would-be successors of Cosway and Ross. Thus art has long ceased to be the appanage of a select and limited class. No longer at the mercy of the haughty patrician, no longer dependent on the veto of an inexorable judge, art defiantly throws down the gauntlet to criticism, content with the suffrages of the groundlings. Instead of receiving it dispenses its favours. Art ceases to feel its way timidly in the shade; it disdains to linger until, discovered by some appreciative eye, and aided by some loving hand, it is raised, and cultivated, and brought to perfection. Forced out into the public glare, and under the public gaze, it has expanded into a luxuriant

growth, and scatters a profusion of blossoms to the *οἱ πολλοὶ* with indiscriminate lavishness.

Turn where we choose we shall find that art has become a motive power as much as a factor in life. Art has entered within the scope of the Social Science Congress. Preached by bishops from the pulpit, it has become an essential feature in the ornamentation of parsonages, no less than the consulting-room of the general practitioner. Art not only dashes through the billows of the sea in the cabins of the yacht and the saloons of the mail steamer, but has produced freemasonry between the stage and the drawing-room; art throws its halo in the wares of the stores, though not without borrowing some light from history. Chairs, specially designed, are called after Cromwell and Madame de Pompadour, Marlborough and St. Stephen; tables after Cleopatra; glass sideboards are 'Gothic,'—albeit the Goths may hardly have known them; jugs are Tudor, Atalanta, and Fleur-de-lis. There are 'art-curtains,' just as there are 'art-chintzes,' receiving their designation from the Louis who sat on the throne of France. Art, with a mighty press of its own, deigns to relieve the dry columns of leading journals; art shows its solicitude for our welfare and personal appearance in daily advertisements which advocate the merits of cocoa and tea and the efficiency of soap. In this manner art has become popularised, but may also become vulgarised. Manufacturers turn the talent of the artist to account for the improvement and advertisement of their wares. Many an artist, however, who, if not thus engaged, would have concentrated his efforts on the production of less remunerative but more deserving work, and wastes and fritters his talents away on the fleeting fancies of fashion. Gifted but unscrupulous artists find a royal road to fortune in pandering to the coarse tastes and vulgar appetites of the million. Countless shillings have flowed into their pockets by exhibiting a work that from the meretriciousness or repulsiveness of its subject should always be denied a place in the Valhalla of British Art. Thus it often occurs that it is not the intrinsic value of a picture, but what can be made out of it, which influences the painter. In these days of facile locomotion, so-called works of art are hawked about, not only in the provinces, but in distant colonies of the empire, the effects of which on the general standard of art as well as on the minds of the public are equally to be deprecated. No doubt every facility should be given to artists for improvement, by the help of schools and patronage. No doubt their efforts should meet with due remuneration in their lifetime, when art grows from the love which is thrown into the work; but when it is made only an object of lucre and a means of courting the gaudy allurements of society, regardless of the endless patience and study required for perfection, art is liable to deteriorate and to injure the taste of the public.

The most conspicuous example of the evil effects of art when misapplied, as well as a proof of the dangers to which pure art is then

exposed, is the so-called "Æsthetic School." Despite the scathing satire of which it has been the object, despite the ridicule that has been heaped on it by dramatists and caricaturists, many a boudoir in Mayfair and Kensington is still gorgeously adorned with sunflowers and peacocks' feathers, which would be more properly confined to the kitchen garden and the aviary. Youths are beguiled into an affectation of unmanliness, and unconsciously diverted from paths which would lead them to a more honourable destination, and in their persons, as well as in the grotesque attire of their wives and their sisters, art is exposed to ridicule. History may or may not repeat itself, but human nature never alters. If we glance back at the history of the civilisation of the world, we shall find that art rose to its highest excellence when it was animated by a great and profound feeling of national sentiment, but degenerated when it became one of the daily cravings and necessities of life. If art reached its zenith when a country had attained the acme of its power, we invariably find that when art constituted an element in the daily lives of the people, and was identified with their manners and occupations, it had an unfavourable effect on their morals and simultaneously degenerated itself. Athens was never greater than in the days of Pericles and Phidias: art was then the embodiment of patriotism. In raising imperishable shrines to their transient deities, and incorporating in exquisite shapes the tutelar divinities of their soil, the Greeks were inspired not only by an intense admiration for art and beauty, but by the desire to give an ideal expression to their love for their country. As soon as this love became secondary to art, and a healthy ambition was sacrificed to a morbid passion for beauty, the country declined and art decayed. During the Middle Ages religion was the main-spring of national feeling, and art, in order to express the devotion of nations, assumed its most beautiful manifestations. Have later efforts surpassed the architecture of those spires which seemed anxious to raise to celestial spheres the yearnings of an enraptured worship, the sculpture of those tombs which enclosed the dust of heroic Crusaders and warriors, or the painting of those frescoes with which a pious hand has sanctified the walls of secluded monasteries? And yet the architect, the sculptor, the painter, was content to achieve the highest degree of excellence, unconscious of his merit, undesirous of notoriety or reward, for the mere love of his Creator, and in commemoration of those who had suffered for their faith.

Certainly art never attained a more pleasing form than during the Renaissance. Artists then grew into as great esteem as the wisest statesmen or most distinguished generals; but as soon as their successors preferred honour and fortune to the mere love of their work, as soon as the masses lost their religious enthusiasm, art eventually degenerated. In what measure art, in those earlier halcyon days, had a direct effect on the morals of the time, it is beyond the scope of these pages to consider, but the mention of the

Renaissance necessarily evokes the recollection of a Borgia who handed poison to his assembled guests in chiselled vessels of gold, and a Catherine de Medici who brought up a train of maids-of-honour with every refinement of artistic luxury and accomplishment as decoys for her political victims. In France, during the seventeenth century, loyalty was the great feeling which animated the French nation, and acquired for her a preponderance in European councils and on European battlefields, and loyalty found its expression in unique compositions of art. In France the King, who represented the country, was supreme. To do honour to the King was to glorify France, and art at once appeared in the magnificence of Versailles and in the splendid domains of the aristocracy. But when, in the eighteenth century, art became indispensable to the lives of the people; when the genius of its greatest artists was degraded to the ornamentation of the bath-room or the alcove; when the soldier's tent was turned into a receptacle of artistic finery, and the enamelled snuff-box was deemed a more important accessory of dress than the jewelled hilt of the sword, art lost its sublimity and elevation, and the moral condition of France sunk to a most deplorable level.

But whatever proportions the expansion of art is destined to assume in England, whatever the effect of that expansion may be on the nation, it will be long ere the moral condition of the nation at large suffers from a similar taint. It has often been said that the people of England are not an artistic race, but it is to be hoped that in their praiseworthy desire to arrive at this end they will never neglect for the sake of an ideal refinement those greater issues in which they have hitherto been so worthily and successfully engaged. At any rate, whether artistic or not, they have always been justly famous for manliness and common-sense; and that sound and manly spirit which has steered them victoriously through the dangerous shoals of political crises and foreign ambition, is likely to shield them effectually from any demoralising influences which the preponderance of art may possess. Let us rejoice over the expansion of art as a factor in life, and as an industry. Let us rejoice that so many Englishmen who are debarred from many of the holidays and amusements which afford relaxation to the Continent, may find in art a legitimate pastime, and that the industry of art may provide for the inhabitants of overcrowded cities new means of employment. Let us hope that the patriotism, the piety, and the loyalty of the people will elevate national art to its loftiest pinnacle, but let us also hope that art will never assume such insuperable proportions in their dispositions and tastes as to lead them to consider that a maudlin craze for the graces of life and an effete luxuriousness is an object of greater moment than those sterner interests and energies which have given to Great Britain the rule of the oceans, and girdled the world with a chain of Imperial realms.

FERDINAND ROTHSCHILD.

## AGRICULTURAL AND COMMERCIAL DEPRESSION.

It would be impossible within the limits of a few pages to deal exhaustively with the questions of Agricultural and Trade depression which at present are engaging public attention, and which have recently been brought under the consideration of both Houses of Parliament. What I chiefly propose to do in this paper is to state a number of outstanding facts, which anyone inclined to adopt "fair trade" or protectionist views ought to consider before he commits himself to the demand for parliamentary investigation, or for that protective legislation to which he might naturally hope such investigation would lead. That the country is to a considerable extent agitated by two opposite sets of opinions must be frankly acknowledged; and the two views may be indicated by the following alternative questions, viz. :—Ought we to look at the present depression in many departments of Trade and Agriculture as an economic fact to be deplored, but temporary in its duration? or, Are we bound to look at it as chronic, and as involving political grievances of a serious nature, which an intelligent Legislature should seek by legislative acts of a protectionist character to remedy? To the first must be given, for reasons which I will endeavour to set forth, a strong affirmative answer; and to the latter an emphatic negative.

Let me first submit a few facts relating to Agriculture. The exclusive cause of the outcry raised under this head appears to be the abnormally low price now being paid for wheat. Barley and oats are selling at fair normal prices. Some farmers, who lay in store cattle and sheep and do not rear them, have been making unremunerative sales. Potatoes are low in price, but the crop has been an abundant one. English wool has been selling at very low prices, but with revived trade in Yorkshire the price is rising. Substantially, however, the "Farmer's Friends" have been founding their outcry on the excessively low price of English wheat, which may be taken as averaging 32s. per quarter in the markets, or 30s. per quarter on the farm. It may be some consolation to English farmers to consider that, if it is impossible for them to grow wheat at 30s. per quarter, and pay the present rents for the land on which the wheat is grown, it is impossible for their foreign competitors to do so. In no country under the sun, taking the average yield of their wheat crops per acre, can wheat be grown to be shipped to England for sale at present prices without heavy loss. In the Far West, in Minnesota and other places, virgin fields in a fine season producing a heavy crop of 22 to

24 bushels per acre may provide a certain quantity of wheat at a cost of 32s. to 34s. per quarter placed in England, if the farmer has neither rent nor mortgage interest to pay. That, however, would be the case with only a very small portion of the total supply. In California wheat cannot be produced to sell in England under 40s. per quarter, except when freights happen, as now, to rule excessively low. But taking the small average produce per acre in the United States, coupled with the fact that the great bulk of farmers have heavy mortgage interest to pay, it is absolute ruin to them to be obliged to force off their wheat at present prices. I have now before me a telegram from a Scotch farmer in Minnesota, in which he speaks of impending ruin if he is compelled to sacrifice his wheat at the prices offered in Minneapolis, the great flour-milling centre; and this, although he had a most favourable season and an excellent crop. The suffering is most acute among American farmers, and the lesson is being taken to heart. We have trustworthy authority for believing that there is already a diminution of the autumn-sown area under winter wheat this season in the United States of 15 per cent., which of itself is equal to 5,000,000 of quarters, and the spring crop is expected to show a still larger percentage of reduction. The distress among American farmers who have mortgage interest to pay must be much greater than the distress among our own agriculturists; seeing that none of our farmers devote their entire acreage to wheat, as so many of the American farmers within the wheat belt do. We have good reason to believe that the Russian farmer cannot grow wheat at the present prices. Any one who knows about the deplorable condition of affairs in Russia, and the indebtedness of farmers to money-lenders, must conclude that it will be quite impossible for them to continue to grow wheat for export at present quotations. We all know that South Australia cannot ship wheat to sell in England at the prices lately current. Most of the wheat shipped this season from Adelaide came on account of shipowners, who paid about 37s. or 38s. per quarter free on board in South Australia, and have been selling it at 33s. to 35s. in England, sinking the entire freight and a few shillings per quarter besides! The present prices would soon ruin South Australian farmers, and we know that while their average yield is very low, many of them have their lands heavily mortgaged. India is getting wheat carried from Bombay to England for less than 20s. per ton. That cannot last. In any case, Indian wheat cannot be grown to sell at present prices. To many farmers in foreign countries it will not be a matter of choice, but of necessity to reduce their acreage under wheat cultivation. For the first time in modern history the wheat crop of the world has been considerably in excess of its power of consumption. The production was all the greater owing to the exceptional fact that in

nearly all the wheat-producing countries of the world the season was favourable, and the 1884 crop was in consequence considerably above an average. How soon might not the disturbing surplus be turned into a deficit?

Let it be remembered that the aggregate yield of wheat in the world (excluding China) may be taken this season as about 225,000,000 of quarters. The European importing countries require, besides their own production, about 25,000,000 of quarters from the nations which grow wheat for export. Now an excess of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of quarters of foreign wheat pressed upon the markets of England, France, and Belgium, beyond ordinary requirements, has been quite sufficient in the present abnormal condition of affairs to force down prices to their present extremely low level; and merchants continue to realise cargo after cargo so long as sellers in foreign countries enable them to replace, on almost equally low terms, the cargoes they thus force upon the markets. The enormous decline in value has been accentuated by the necessities of the foreign producer, and the pressure has acted and reacted to the grievous loss and detriment of all concerned. But how soon might not this plethora be followed by scarcity and high prices? The present cheap loaf is an immense boon to our labouring and artizan population; has any protectionist considered the possibility of occasional disaster overtaking the wheat crop of the United States or of India? If such a catastrophe were to happen simultaneously with a bad crop in Europe (a contingency by no means improbable) how long does he think the English democracy would stand protective duties with the four-pound loaf raised perhaps to 8d. or 10d. instead of 4d., as at present? The present price of wheat is obviously unduly low, but good reasons exist for our entertaining the belief that this extremely low price is purely exceptional, and is likely to be of very temporary duration.

After all, the total value of our wheat crop this year, deducting seed, is only about £15,000,000. On the basis of fair market prices it would have produced probably £20,000,000. If the acreage some years ago under wheat was considerably larger than now, we may rest assured that the farmer is now producing more largely of other commodities, which experience has taught him he can produce with greater advantage and profit. Have the advocates of protection considered that the necessities of our dense population caused us to import last year (1883) of wheat, flour, maize, and grain of all kinds a total value of £67,622,367, of which £43,795,259 was the value of wheat and flour alone? And is there not grave cause for alarm lest an agitation for a duty of 4s. or 5s. per quarter should discourage the growth of those foreign supplies which are of as vital necessity to our artizan population as is the free import of the raw material for our textile and other industries? The very magnitude of the imports

of food proves the magnitude of the need, and it does seem strange that reasonable men should be found ready to recommend measures which would cut off some of our much-needed food supply at its very source, and raise the cost of all the rest, both home-grown and imported. Moreover, the value of our native-grown wheat is comparatively unimportant when contrasted with the annual value of our entire home-grown and imported food supplies. The danger of scanty supplies in time of war is too remote and intangible to form a substantial element in the controversy. Besides, a wise and energetic mercantile provision, with the supplies of the entire world open to us, is more likely to be efficacious than the adoption of protective duties for supplying the wants of our people. Has the fact been realised that the farmers of the United Kingdom and Ireland sell annually £30,000,000 value of milk, which is double the value of this year's wheat crop? This calculation, equal to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  pints per head per week of the population, is a consumption which might be greatly increased with manifest advantage, not only to the farmer but to the entire community.

Again, why should our farmers persist in raising wheat if other countries can raise it cheaper than our own, while they neglect markets for other commodities at their own door, which they might easily supply, but which they allow foreigners largely to monopolise? We imported last year the following from foreign countries:—

Butter and butterine . . . . .	: £11,773,000
Cheese . . . . .	4,890,000
Eggs . . . . .	2,732,000
Poultry and game . . . . .	591,000
Total . . . . .	<u>£19,986,000</u>

There are commodities which we can produce better than the foreigner, and which it is a reproach to us that we do not ourselves provide for our own consumers. Again, why is it that so few of our farmers raise their own stock? Why should they be tempted to sell calves for a few shillings a head to the butchers instead of rearing them? They are often compelled to pay too high prices for store cattle, and then complain they cannot make the business answer, while, if a little pains were taken and the blafdishments of the butchers resisted, our flocks and herds might be largely increased with more profit to the careful farmer than the raising of wheat is ever likely to be. At least he might grow less wheat, and produce more beef, bacon, butter, eggs, cheese, and milk.

The belief is becoming general that the race of gentlemen farmers, except such as have cheap farms and understand the successful application of labour, will, ere long, be very largely diminished. The race



of stolid farmers who have but little capital and do not themselves work, and who consider it a part of their religion to follow the antiquated order of things and to attend three or four country markets every week, instead of attending to their farming industry, must gradually become extinct. The farmers, who now prosper—and there are many such even in these civil times—are men who, along with their sons and daughters, work assiduously with their own hands, as the American farmers do. A subdivision of large farms into holdings varying from 40, 60, 100, to 120 acres, with modest houses, and buildings suitable for dairy work and rearing cattle, with security of tenure to tenants as well as compensation for improvements, would be the best solution of present difficulties and the best arrangement for the bulk of our landowners. Estates carried on henceforth on some such basis, with industrious farmers who are prepared to labour with their own hands, would yield to landowners a far more secure revenue than they can possibly count on so long as agriculture is prosecuted in England under present conditions. The change in any case must be gradual. Meanwhile, under existing conditions, a large reduction of rent seems to be indispensable. “A substantial reduction in rent, coupled with complete legal security for all improvements, together with freedom to make improvements, to crop their farms, and to sell their produce to the best of their judgment,” was the resolution almost unanimously adopted by the Farmers’ Alliance on 17th November; and the farmers present, who scouted the idea of protective duties, were wiser in their generation than the protectionist landowners who seek to lead them astray with vain and delusive hopes and expectations.

Reverting to the supplying of markets at their own doors with commodities which can be raised more profitably than wheat, I am persuaded that a race of intelligent working farmers whose wives and families would give attention to the rearing of calves and pigs, and to the raising of dairy produce, might entirely alter the present aspect of agriculture in England. Where the land will not hold permanent pasture much may be done by ensilage. In any case there is great room for improving our present methods. Besides the commodities already enumerated which our farmers might raise better than the foreigners who supply us, they might surely render it less necessary to import live and dead meat so heavily as we do. The following are some items of our imports during 1883:—

Live animals—oxen and sheep	£11,850,000
Dead meat, salted or fresh	2,894,000
Meat, unenumerated	808,000
Preserved meat (not salted)	1,753,000
Mutton	696,000
Bacon and hams	10,036,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£28,037,000</b>

Possibly we could not reduce our indebtedness for these commodities very greatly. But a good deal might be done. It is the experience of many that it is profitable to raise pigs and convert them into hams and bacon. Yet we are paying £10,000,000 for hams and bacon to the Americans yearly.

The farmers' friends delude them by magnifying the burden of the rates and taxes which they pay, and persuade them that "all burdens not borne by foreign and colonial farmers should be taken off, or an equivalent duty should be imposed on foreign corn." What have they to say of the dear clothing, and the heavy taxation of a totally different character from that which our farmers bear, which foreign farmers have to submit to? Even in the way of local, county, and education rates on land the American farmer has to pay from 1 to 2½ per cent. annually, not on the rent but on the value of the fee-simple of his farm. This means a taxation equal to a third or fourth of a rent computed on the basis of the ordinary returns received from land investments in this country.

Turning now to the consideration of the depression in Commerce, I venture to contend that we are mainly suffering from overproduction in those industries most seriously affected at the present time. The shipowning interest is the one which perhaps is suffering most severely, but the reason for this is not far to seek.

In 1875 the sailing tonnage of the United Kingdom amounted to . . . . .	4,144,504 tons.
The steam tonnage to . . . . .	1,943,197 „
Together . . . . .	<u>6,087,701 „</u>
In 1883 the sailing tonnage was . . . . .	3,471,172 tons.
The steam tonnage had risen to . . . . .	3,725,229 „
Together . . . . .	<u>7,196,401 „</u>

But that is only a partial and misleading view of the real state of the case, for, seeing that steam vessels do three times the work of sailing ships, it would appear that in eight years the carrying capacity of the mere increase in our steam tonnage since 1875 is more than equal to the entire carrying capacity of our mercantile navy of sailing ships at the present time. The real increase in the capacity for work of our tonnage since 1875 would more accurately be represented by the following figures:—

1875. Sailing ships . . . . .	4,144,504 tons.
Steam, 1,943,197 tons, multiplied by 3 to compare with sailing-ship tonnage . . . . .	5,829,591 „
Joint capacity for work . . . . .	<u>9,974,095 „</u>

1883. Sailing ships	3,471,173 tons.
Steam, 3,725,229 tons, multiplied by 3 to compare with sailing-ship tonnage	11,175,687 „
Joint capacity for work	<u>14,646,860 „</u>

Such an increase has been altogether wild and unjustifiable, seeing our Import and Export trade has not grown of late years to any appreciable extent, and that our foreign commerce has for the present lost its former elasticity. The Member for Birkenhead, who is a shipowner, chooses to pour out his sorrows on the floor of the House of Commons, and entreats Parliament to find a remedy. It would be more becoming that shipowners should seek some secluded spot, and shed penitential tears over mistakes and miscalculations which it is utterly beyond the power of the House of Commons to remedy. We shipowners (for I must myself speak as an erring member of the body) have seen the enormous yearly increase in our tonnage, and we gave no heed to the lesson till adversity has shown us our folly. As an instance of folly, I may state that one steam-ship company which has come into existence within the last few years, and which has had to create trades for its vessels, has floated about two miles in consecutive length of steamships within a very short space of time. Not only has ill-advised enterprise of this description been most unprofitable to those concerned, but it has spread dismay among all the other companies, with which its necessities have compelled it to enter into competition.

The over-production of shipping property, and the present ruinous state of that industry, have most seriously and directly affected the ship-building trade, and the smaller industries connected with the outfit of vessels. As yet we cannot discern any indications of improvement. None are visible either for shipowners or for shipbuilders at the present time; and in the very nature of things it is essential there should be a pause, probably of long duration, in the building of vessels. Many steamships and sailing-vessels are now laid up in our ports, and the tonnage afloat is, on the whole, being sailed at serious loss to its owners. The evil will, ere long, rectify itself, though probably not so soon as some anticipate. In any case we are not losing our supremacy, for if the position of affairs is bad with our shipowners, it is infinitely worse with all our foreign competitors. The tonnage bounty in France has been a "snare and a delusion," and at the present moment the mercantile marine of France is in a far from prosperous condition.

The cessation of iron shipbuilding and the collapse of railway enterprise in America have naturally affected our iron industry, and for the present the making of iron is unprofitable, unsatisfactory, and restricted. There is, however, an elasticity about the iron industry, which sooner or later will bring it round, and we may

reasonably hope for a revival in the demand much sooner than there is any reason to hope for improvement in shipowning or shipbuilding.

It is consolatory to be able to turn from the consideration of distressed industries to some which are, upon the whole, prosperous, and in which artisans and operatives are, fully employed. One such is the worsted and woollen trade of Yorkshire—more especially of Bradford. It is most gratifying to find in that centre of industry, which was filled with gloom and anxious forebodings a couple of years ago, that the population is now fully employed, and that some machinery is actually standing idle from want of a sufficient supply of skilled operatives to keep it going. The great cotton industry is likewise in a better condition than it was a year ago. Manufacturers' profits are undoubtedly extremely small, but there is a fair demand for goods, and the operatives are well employed. The manufacturers of Leicester and Nottingham are not now earning the large profits they were making in 1881 and 1882; but trade in those districts cannot now be said to be very bad, and the operatives are well occupied. The demand for coal at present is large, and coalowners are, upon the whole, in a prosperous condition—especially in Wales. The copper trade, all through the late period of depression, has been well maintained. If copper smelters have not been exceedingly prosperous—owing, perhaps, to the rapid and steady decline in the price of copper—their works and their men have at least been fully occupied, and their industry has grown of late by leaps and bounds. It may be of interest to give a few figures relating to the copper trade. The following have been the deliveries to smelters and others of foreign copper, consisting of copper ores, half-smelted copper, and bars, at the ports of London, Swansea, and Liverpool, stated in tons of pure copper:—

1880	.	.	.	.	.	.	64,451 tons.
1881	.	.	.	.	.	.	63,397 „
1882	.	.	.	.	.	.	67,382 „
1883	.	.	.	.	.	.	73,394 „
1884, up to 15th December,	84,441 tons,						
which may be taken <i>pro rata</i> for							
the twelve months as	.	.	.	.	.	.	88,112 „

The supply from the Cornish mines has fallen off very markedly during the last quarter of a century, and must ere long become extinct—not from failure of the ores, but because the mines cannot be worked in competition with rich copper-mines abroad. The following data may be interesting. In the year 1800 the produce of British mines forming the entire supply was 11,500 tons pure copper. In 1832, the year before any foreign copper was imported, the total had only risen to 11,941 tons pure copper. In 1833 foreign ores from Cuba and Chili were imported to a limited extent, but smelters had to give bond to re-export the copper product within six months,

and were on that account often forced to sell for France at £5, or even £10, per ton under the price which they were getting in Birmingham. These fetters and restrictions were swept away with the Navigation Laws, and ever since the copper trade has increased rapidly, and continues to grow marvellously. The Cornwall and other British copper mines attained their maximum importance in 1856, when they yielded 13,275 tons of pure copper. In 1862 the production had fallen to 11,268 tons; 1875 production gave only 3,370 tons, 1880 gave only 2,783 tons, 1883 gave 2,526 tons, and 1884 only 2,410 tons. It results, therefore, that our copper industry, which half a century ago was fed entirely by the produce of our own mines, and which was established solely to utilise that produce, came, through the operation of unrestricted commerce, to be fed in 1884 as follows, viz.:—

From the home sources of supply with . . . . .	2,416 tons.
From foreign sources with . . . . .	88,112 „

Who can doubt but that the operation of our unrestricted commercial policy has been, in regard to this great industry, of the most beneficent character? Yet the ruined British copper-miner might have called out in past years as lustily as some British landowners are now doing for inquiry, in order to make good a demand for protective duties. Had such a demand been granted to the copper-miners of Cornwall, the copper trade might have been strangled, and the development of this important industry in England might never have attained the pre-eminence it enjoys.

In most of our other principal industries there is fair employment for artisans and operatives. Undoubtedly the manufacturers' profit is in many of them much reduced. But our exports are well maintained. Rectified by the extremely low prices of our productions, the statistical tables would go to show that their volume is on the whole larger than in any previous year of our history.

The class which has of late suffered most acutely, in addition to shipowners and shipbuilders, is the mercantile body engaged in the import trade of the country. The steady and extremely heavy decline in the prices of most of our articles of import, such as sugar, bread-stuffs, wool, and other commodities, has seriously affected the stability of a very large portion of our mercantile community, and is a fact which cannot be looked upon without grave misgiving. The plethora of commodities forced upon our overstocked markets has been ruinous to many of our merchants, and the depletion which has been going on in so many quarters must have seriously curtailed the aggregate capital of merchants engaged in the transaction of our foreign commerce. The margins of gain are now at the best so reduced by the new methods of conducting our foreign commerce, especially by the

use of the electric telegraph, that when an evil time comes losses are all the more severely felt. The competition among all classes engaged in our foreign trade is now so fierce that a merchant's business, if actively carried on, has become more akin to that of a broker, with this difference, that on the narrowest of margins immense risks have to be run by the merchant and immense sums of money invested for the most insignificant gain or commission, while the broker is not called on to provide any capital whatever.

In the face of this recognised fact it is distressing to see the number of young men struggling for admission to the offices of our merchants, where, under the altered condition of things, the great majority of them can only learn the hazardous character of modern merchandising and the hardness of the struggle for existence. Yet it is an axiom, and one which free-traders ought never to lose sight of, that the wealth of nations is chiefly stimulated and increased by the large and, as far as possible, unrestricted interchange of commodities. Merchants will be found ready and eager to do the work. Of enterprise and energy we have no lack, and are not likely to suffer lack, notwithstanding present discouragement. It would be a deplorable thing for England were we, under the influence of party clamour and the false light of so-called fair trade teachings, to cease being an example to the nations of the tenacity with which this axiom is held by us as of paramount importance. I have spoken of unrestricted interchange, with a limitation. That limitation, of course, refers to the duties on wines and spirits, which we impose for moral reasons as well as to make the impost harmonise with our own Excise duties. The Customs duties, which we still impose on a few articles of import, are chiefly on luxuries which are not necessaries of life; our maintenance of which for revenue purposes, although it may somewhat restrict consumption, cannot be taken as an appreciable interference with the scope and tendency of free trade.

There is, if I may be permitted to say so, an extremely narrowing tendency in these fair trade or protective teachings, which seems to me to call for special notice. If it were to be the grand object and aim of nations to subsist on the products of their own soil, and to acquire as little as possible of the productions of other countries, the idea could, to a very large extent, be carried out by most of them. But it would be to a considerable extent a relapse to the usages of semi-civilised and uncultured life. The narrowing tendency of such false theories, even on the mind of so intelligent an exponent of them as Mr. Eckroyd was reflected in his recent speech in the House of Commons, when he denounced the planting of industrial enterprises in foreign countries by means of British energy and British capital. His objection to English manufacturers establishing branches of their industry in France would equally apply to the large investment of

English capital in the jute mills of Calcutta and in the cotton mills of Bombay. It would go to prohibit the development of outside international commerce by the enterprise and capital and ships of English merchants. It would stop the supply of Chinese markets with cotton yarns from Bombay, and of the California farmer with grain-bags from Calcutta. If applied earlier, I don't see why it might not have prevented the growth of wool in Australia through the enterprise and capital taken out by the earlier settlers. It would discourage the large investments by Conservative fair traders in cattle-ranches and in mortgage companies in America. It would stop the planting of English iron-foundries in every foreign country, and it would put an end to English mining enterprises in every corner of the globe. I have enumerated these industries, and might enumerate others, with a double object:—First, to show the narrowing tendency, on the mind of men, of what is called protection or reciprocity, and, secondly, to indicate that there are vast fields of enterprise abroad, which are occupied by British merchants and developed by means of British capital, which yield large gains to our merchants, bankers, and shipowners, and which, to a very large extent, go to maintain and extend our supremacy in the field of commercial enterprise, and to augment our growing wealth at home. The tide ebbs and flows. On the whole, however, we may take comfort from the fact that we are not losing ground. It is indisputable, that our unfettered commerce, our exemption from the curse of militarism, our untaxed food, and our many other advantages as producers, give us absolute supremacy in supplying more cheaply than any other competitor the wants of at least three-quarters of the globe, where manufactures do not exist or are almost unknown. The markets of Asia, Africa and South America are practically ours through the operation of our unrestricted trade system. It is an idle dream to imagine that American artisans, with their more trying climate, their heavy house rents, their very expensive clothing, and the high prices they pay for all imported luxuries or necessities of life; or that French operatives, with their burdensome municipal charges and *octroi* taxes on food, the increased imperial-taxation on their bread, the higher cost of serviceable clothing, and of many other necessities of life, can compete with us in supplying the rest of the world with the productions of our manufacturing industries. That the expenditure of a French workman on his family is heavier than that of an English workman may be seen from the fact that while English wholesale dealers can now buy French refined sugar at £18 per ton, free on board at Havre, and are retailing it with profit at two-pence halfpenny to three-pence per pound, the French dealer has to pay £48 per ton for French refined sugar delivered in Paris, and the current retail price paid by the French artisan is about sevenpence

or eightpence per pound. With the burden of such imposts to bear, and the taxation which the spirit of militarism, and their costly and hurtful bounty systems in France and in other continental countries, demand, our artisans and operatives may congratulate themselves on having the advantage in the battle of life, even if they have not at the present time full employment, or if they have to submit in less prosperous times to a reduction in their wages.

Another difficulty connected with the application of a fair trade policy seems to have been lost sight of by the advocates of reciprocity. They have apparently failed to realise the fact that any attempt to adjust our tariff to the exigencies of a reciprocity system would at once bring us into contention with other nations through the practical abrogation in many instances of the "most favoured nation" clauses in our treaties. Instead, therefore, of securing benefits for ourselves, we might only earn reprisals. There are countries, as Chili and the Argentine Provinces, sending us considerable supplies of wheat, which tax English goods 30 or 40 per cent. solely for revenue purposes, and not to protect manufacturing interests. On the other hand there are countries which impose more moderate duties on our goods but it is done partly to protect their own manufactures and partly for revenue purposes. Is it possible for us to pass judgment on the motives or fiscal systems of other governments with absolute impartiality; and would it be wise on our part to make the attempt? It is surely impolitic for us through the pressure of a tariff constructed on the principles of reciprocity to endeavour to force upon countries, such as the South American States, the abandonment of the system of indirect taxation to which they mainly trust, and the adoption of direct taxation, which they dislike. Our interference would be resented, very probably to our loss and confusion; and this is only one example of the difficulties which the practical application of the schemes of fair traders would bring upon us.

There are, nevertheless, some hindrances to our prosperity which it would be a mistake to pass over in silence. There is the tide of drunkenness which ratepayers in England ought to have the power of stemming by means of a better licensing system, over and above all that may be accomplished through the influences of salutary teaching and moral suasion. No one who has seen, as I have done, the thriving manufacturing town of Lewiston in the State of Maine, a place with 25,000 inhabitants, and witnessed of an evening the crowded foot-paths, the well-filled shops, and the thriving trade done by the drapers, the grocers, the shoemakers and other tradesmen of the place, can have failed to mark the healthful impulse given to honest trade by the banishment of the drink shop. I do not believe it practicable to apply the Maine Liquor Law in England, but it is surely not out of place to point out the manifest advantages of sobriety, even of



enforced sobriety, when one is alluding to the detriment to our trade caused by the excessive drinking habits of our people, and when, over and above that, one might point to the wasting of vital power, the lost labour, and the increase of pauperism, which they engender. We export 85 per cent. of our cotton manufactures. We only use 15 per cent. of them at home. If we could only economise from our drink bill so as to use an additional 5 per cent. of our cotton goods it would frequently make all the difference between stagnation and fair trade in that important branch of our industry. Surely the point is one demanding more than a cursory thought or glance. My expectation is that under the operation of the extended franchise one of the first things which a reinforced Democracy will do will be to save themselves and the country from the ruinous waste which is now impoverishing us, and which is so largely caused by the superabounding licensed temptations which beset our working men on every hand.

Then there are more abstract questions, such as one indicated by Mr. Goschen in a parliamentary debate last year, relating to the appreciation of gold through the inadequacy of the supply of that metal for the metallic currencies of all nations now scrambling for it. At frequently recurring periods our banking reserves of gold get suddenly diminished, either through the legitimate expansion of internal circulation, or equally legitimate demands upon us from abroad. This naturally acts as a check on commerce through the sudden and rapid advance of the bank rates and curtailment of credit, and it cannot be looked upon by business men with composure. When Mr. Goschen used the term "appreciation of gold" his indication directly pointed to the use of silver as well as gold for international legal tender money. Undoubtedly the necessity, sooner or later, for a dispassionate consideration of this question presses itself on the minds of many intelligent merchants; but, at the same time, it must be acknowledged that the scarcity of gold has had less to do with mercantile distress of late than the plethora of commodities. This is borne out by the fact that while imported breadstuffs have gradually gone down to zero, owing to superabundant supplies, imported animal food has during recent years risen in price (notwithstanding the appreciation of gold) for the simple reason that the demand has kept pace with the supply.

Above all, it ought to be a matter of national and political concern, bearing, as it does most directly on our commercial prosperity, that we should be resolute in maintaining administrations bound by the mandate of the people to pursue a peaceful and just foreign policy. In 1877, 1878, and part of 1879 the general trade of the country was in a worse condition than it is at present, and the government of Lord Beaconsfield was much blamed for the then depressed condition of our industries, which was directly attributed to the constant fear

of complications through its aggressive and spirited foreign policy. Perhaps in the heat of political controversy a somewhat exaggerated view was taken, but undoubtedly that policy was injurious at the time, and continues to bear bitter fruit still. It is true, on the other hand, that a marked improvement in many directions followed the accession to office of the government of Mr. Gladstone. The reasons accounting for the check recently given to the prosperity of several of our industries I have endeavoured to explain in this paper, and it is obvious that it is neither directly or indirectly attributable to the action of the present administration. I have endeavoured to show that the present distress is of a very exceptional character, and arises from causes which lie upon the surface, requiring neither parliamentary investigation nor remedial measures, such, at all events, as those which "fair traders" recommend to us. Much of the commercial distress, it is to be hoped, will speedily pass away; while, in the main, it is consolatory for us to consider that the great majority of our industries are fairly prosperous, and our artisans and operatives fairly well employed. A marked and significant contrast, greatly in favour of this country, may even now be drawn between the actual condition of England under her free trade policy and the distressed condition of those countries which are now suffering much more acutely from their restrictive commercial systems and their obnoxious and injurious tariffs. It would be a suicidal and most short-sighted policy on the part of any of our political leaders were they to lend any countenance to the protectionist or reciprocity theories which are now being inculcated by a few of our less responsible politicians. We shall succeed best by adhering to the old lines of unrestricted commerce, by the following of which we have enormously increased our national wealth during the last forty years. The present trade depression, it is to be hoped, may not be of long duration; but in any case, it affords no justification whatever for the expectation that protection, under any name or form, would bring us the smallest alleviation. In respect of those industries which are now suffering most acutely—namely, shipowning and shipbuilding—it must be evident that any policy which would restrict the interchange of commodities would only bring prejudice and injury, instead of comfort or relief.

S. WILLIAMSON.

## BEHIND THE SCENES.

DURING the past year there has been a considerable amount of discussion, within the circumference of a comparatively inconsiderable circle, as to the social position of the professional actor. It is a subject that crops up from time to time, attracting more or less attention to itself from those outside the boundary, according to whatever may happen to be the prevalent artistic development, or the latest fashionable craze. The tone of the disputants and the weight of their individual character must, of course, be taken into account. The actor is of all professors of any kind of art the one who is most before the public. The result of his study is ephemeral: "he struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more," though nowadays, the strutting and fretting are not by any means limited to the hour upon the stage; and at the present time there seems to be some anxiety on the part of the children of Thespis to obtain such an authoritative definition of their status, as shall put their position in society above all question, by placing them on a level with the members of the recognised professions. It is asserted that the professional actor is far differently situated now from what he was fifty, or even thirty years ago. Actor and actress are, it is pointed out, received everywhere, petted, fêted, lionized and made much of; our young men of birth and education, but of limited purse, take to the stage, professionally, as an honourable means of earning their livelihood, just as the youngest son of a good, but impoverished family, used to be sent into the Church, in order to hold a family living. Further, it has been said that for our young ladies to go on the stage is not now considered, as heretofore, a disgrace, but, on the contrary, rather a plume in their bonnets. Altogether it may be fairly inferred that there has recently been a movement theatrewards, favourable to the social prospects of the professional actor. But has it been anything more than this? Is the actor's calling one whit nearer being recognised as on a social equality with the regular professions than it was fifty years ago?

Throughout this article I shall use the word "society" in its widest and most comprehensive acceptation, except of course where its limitation is expressly stated.

A "status in society" means a certain standing among one's fellow subjects, fixed by law, recognised by traditional usage, and acknowledged by every one, from the highest to the lowest. Formerly, it is well known, it was not admitted, that as one of the "rogues and vagabonds" by Act of Parliament the actor, *quâ* actor, had no more status in society than our indigent professional beggar with whom he was unjustly classed.

"The strolling tribe, a despicable race,  
Like wandering Arabs, shift from place to place."

And even now, when this blot on our statute-book has been erased, a respectable theatrical company, travelling in the provinces, is described in the law courts as "a company of strolling players." Undoubtedly, in a liberal age, the actor's disabilities have been removed; but is he not asking for what is an impossibility from the very nature of the case, when he advances a claim for the recognition of his "calling" as on an equality with the acknowledged professions, which, of themselves, confer a certain honourable *status* on their members, stamping them, so far, gentlemen? A man who is a gentleman by birth and education is, as Mrs. Micawber phrases it, "eligible" for the best society; and he can only forfeit his social position by misconduct. Now one question is, does "going on the stage" imply forfeiture of social position? To consider this impartially we must get entirely away from Leo Hunter associations and cliques established on the mutual admiration principle. The test cases are soon and easily put. Let us suppose the case of the son of an impoverished peer. He cannot afford to be idle. He has a liking for the bar: he passes his examination and becomes a barrister; or he has an inclination for the Church, and there being a family living vacant, and plenty of interest to get him on, he takes orders. In either case does he forfeit his social position? Certainly not: if anything, he improves it by becoming a member of an honourable and dignified profession. Supposing he has money, and prefers soldiering or sailing to doing absolutely nothing, does he forfeit his social position by becoming an officer? Certainly not: on the contrary he improves his already good social status. I maintain that, *primâ facie*, for a man to be an officer, a barrister, or a clergyman, is in itself a passport to any English society. Wherever he is personally unknown, it is assumed that he is a gentleman, until the contrary is proved; and this assumption is on the strength of his profession only. Let the rank of our hypothetical peer's son be subsequently discovered, and for that representative portion of society which has "entertained an angel unawares," he has the recommendation of his nobility *plus* the social position implied by his profession.

But how if the son of our "poor nobleman" have a taste for theatricals, and, after being at Eton and Oxford, determine on "adopting the stage as a profession," or, as it might be more correctly put, "in lieu of a profession." What will his noble father and his relatives say to this step? Will they be as pleased as if he were going into the army, or to the bar, or into the Church? Not exactly. If he became an officer, a barrister, or a clergyman, the event would be officially notified in due form; but if he went on the stage there would be startling paragraphs in the papers announcing "The Son of an

*Earl on the Stage*," "The Honourable Mr. So-and-So has adopted the profession of the stage, &c. &c." "Well, and why not?" some will exclaim; and others will commend his pluck, and say, "Quite right too." I entirely agree with them. But the point is, has the young gentleman taken a step up the social ladder, or has he gone more than two or three down? Has he improved his position, or injured it? Certainly, as matters stand, there can be but one answer,—the step he has taken has seriously affected the position to which his birth and education entitle him.

As a barrister or circuit I have supposed him received *quâ* barrister with his legal brethren; as an officer, quartered in a garrison town, we know he will be received, *quâ* officer, with his brother officers, and no questions asked; and I have alluded to the satisfaction that will be felt (snobbery of course is taken for granted everywhere) when his rank is discovered. But as a player with other players in a country town, will he be received by society, it being understood that *because* he is a player, *therefore* he is a gentleman by birth and education? On becoming a soldier, or a barrister, does anyone change his name? No: but on going "on the stage" it is the rule for anyone to conceal his identity under some name widely different from his own, just as he conceals his individuality behind the footlights with cosmetics, burnt cork, and an eccentric wig. When it is ascertained who he is, will this same society, which would have received him as a barrister, be satisfied and delighted? No, probably scandalised. It will be with these simple, old-fashioned persons a foregone conclusion, that this scion of a noble house must be a loose sort of fellow, and they will decide that the less they see of him the better.

There is one reason why the aspirant for Thespian honours (if such he really be) should change his name, and that is the chance of failure. If he goes on the stage as somebody else, and fails as somebody else, very few will hear of it, and he may quit "the boards" none the worse, perhaps, for the experience; but for some considerable time, until in fact he has "lived it down," he will be very careful to conceal this episode in his career from the world at large.

Before getting at the very essence of the difficulty, I will ask in what light do our upper-middle class, and upper-lower middle class, and the remainder of that form (the public-school divisions are useful) regard the stage as a means of earning a livelihood?

We must put out of the case entirely all instances of genius. An histrionic genius *will* be an actor, and his success will justify his choice. The force of his genius will take him everywhere. Genius excuses a multitude of faults and solecisms. We must, too, leave out of the question cases of exceptional talent, where there is more than an occasional spark of the *feu sacré*. Whether histrionic genius could be better utilised than on the stage, may occur to some serious

minds with a decided anti-theatrical bias. But the histrion for the stage, and the stage for the histrion, and we must take the stage as it is for what it is, and not for what it is not. Such a reform of the stage as shall give its members something like the status they very properly covet, is a matter for future consideration. Let it be understood then—and I cannot impress this too often on those who do me the honour of reading my contribution towards the discussion,—that I am only speaking of very ordinary men and women ~~going to~~ the stage as a means of earning their livelihood. The men first; it is not yet awhile *place aux dames*, when professions are concerned.

Whatever theatrical biography I have taken up, I can call to mind but very few instances of a man going on the stage with the full approbation of his relatives. Let his parents be small or large tradesmen, civil servants, clerks in the City, no matter what, they rarely took kindly to their son “going on the stage.” It was so: is it not so now? The bourgeois is as dead against his son becoming an actor as ever he was. Scratch the British bourgeois and you’ll come upon the puritan.

Supposing a tradesman, free from narrow prejudices, and theatrically inclined, a regular theatre-goer in fact,—will he be one whit more favourable to his son’s becoming an actor? No: rather the contrary. He will not indeed regard him as going straight to a place unmentionable, as probably he will not consider the religious bearings of the “vocation” at all, but he will not give the youth his blessing, and he may contemplate omitting his name from his will. Supposing this same son had told his father that he wanted to be a barrister, and in order to do so he should like, as a first step, to serve as a clerk in a solicitor’s office, wouldn’t the old tradesman be pleased? Certainly. He might, indeed, prove to the lad that if he would stick to the business he would be better off for a certainty, but, all the same, the youth’s aspirations would give his parent considerable pleasure. And, to be brief, here is a case which will bring the question directly home to everyone; given equality in every other respect, and which would be preferred as a son-in-law, the ordinary actor, or the briefless barrister?

The question of the social status of the stage is still more important as affecting ladies who have to earn their livelihood. At the present day there are more chances of suitable employment for educated, respectably-connected girls than there were fifty years ago. As yet, however, the demand exceeds the supply. Few occupations insure to successful ladies such good pay as stage-playing; but, as in the previous instances, “on the spear side,” so now, we must consider the case of girls of ordinary intelligence, well brought up, not by any means geniuses, with no particular talent, and who have to earn their living.

If they cannot paint plates and doileys, or copy pictures in oils, if they object to any clerkly drudgery that has something menial in it, and if, as has been affirmed, they "turn with a sigh of relief towards the vista of the stage," let us see what this "vista" has to offer, and on what terms. And to do this we had better take a glance at "professional," i.e., "theatrical" life.

What Tom Robertson, whose personal experience of every variety of theatrical life was considerable, in his thoroughly English (let us be grateful for this, at all events) play of *Caste* left to the imagination, in giving us Eccles as a widower, and bestowing an honest, hard-working lover on Polly (this was a mistake, except as a concession to respectability, for Polly was never meant to be a Mrs. Sam Gerridge, a small tradesman's wife, or, if she were, so much the worse for Sam), M. Halévy in his *Monsieur et Madame Cardinal* has put before his readers very plainly. "The scenes in Georges Ohnet's *Lise Fleurba* are not merely peculiar to the French stage; and only to those who want to know the seamy side of a strolling player's life would I recommend *A Mummer's Wife*, but not otherwise; as the realism of Mr. Moore's story is repulsive. Be it remembered, however, that the best chance for girls who seek an engagement at a London theatre, is to travel with a company "on tour," and so learn experience by constant and frequently varying practice. "The Stage" is an art, and not a profession, and an art which, as a means of obtaining a bare livelihood, is open to everybody possessing ordinary natural faculties, offering employment without requiring from the applicants any special qualification or any certificate from schoolmaster, pastor, or master, and therefore it must be the resort of all who, unable or unwilling to do anything else, are content to earn their few shillings a week, and to be in the same category with Garrick, Macready, Phelps, and Kean; for the "super" who earns his money by strict attention to business, and who has night after night for a lifetime, no more than a few lines to say, is briefly described in the census as "Actor," as would be the leading tragedian or comedian of the day. He is a supernumerary, i.e., a supernumerary actor; and a supernumerary, abbreviated to "super," attached to the theatre, he lives and dies. In civil and Government offices there are supernumeraries. They are supernumerary clerks, and none the less clerks on that account. If taken on to the regular staff, they cease to be called supernumeraries, and if a super on the stage should exhibit decided histrionic talent, he, too, would cease to be a super and become an actor, that is, he would drop the qualification of "supernumerary." So for the "extra ladies," as they are politely termed, who are the female supers. As a rule, the extras are as good, hard-working people as you will find anywhere. They have "come down" to this, and in most cases consider their position as a descent in the social scale, no matter what they may have been before. A few may take the

place for the sake of obtaining "an appearance," with a view to something better; some as a means of honest livelihood, and to help the family in its "little house in Stangate;" and others, to whom a small salary is not so much an object as to obtain relief from the monotony of evenings at home, take to the stage in this, or any other capacity, as "extras" in burlesque, in pantomime, or as strengthening a chorus; and to these the theatre is a source of profitable amusement. These being some of the essential component parts of most theatrical companies, would any of us wish our daughters to "go on the stage?"

There can be but one answer to this: No; certainly we would rather they did not choose the stage as the means of earning a livelihood. But some objector will say, "Surely my daughter need not associate with such persons as you describe." I answer No; she need not off the stage, but how is she to avoid it in the theatre? Your daughter, my dear sir, is not all at once a Mrs. Siddons; she is a beginner. Perhaps she never will be a Mrs. Siddons; perhaps she will never get beyond playing a soubrette, or, if she cannot deliver her lines well, and has not the fatal gift of beauty, she may, being there only to earn her livelihood, be compelled to remain among the extras. At all events, she cannot expect to consort in the theatre with the stars and with the leading ladies. The manageress may "know her at home," and do everything she can for her; but she cannot be unjust to others, and your daughter must dress in the same room with the "extras," just as Lord Tomnoddy, should he choose to take the Queen's shilling, must put up with the other privates in barracks. The officers may have "known him at home," but that can't be helped now. Your daughter, my dear lady, goes on to the stage in preference to being a governess, to earn money to relieve her parents of a burden, and to replenish the family purse. Excellent motive! But can you, her mother, always be with her? Can you accompany her to rehearsals, and be with her every evening in the dressing-room of the theatre, where there are generally about a dozen others, more or less according to the accommodation provided by the theatre? If you make your companionship a *sine qua non*, will it not prevent any manager from engaging your daughter? They cannot have the dressing-rooms full of mothers; they cannot spare the space, and mothers cannot be permitted to encumber green-rooms and the "wings." You may have implicit confidence in your child and in her manager and manageress, but the latter have something else to do besides looking after your daughter. "Some theatres," you will say, "are more respectable than others." True; but your daughter, having to earn her daily bread by her profession, cannot select her theatre. It is a hard saying, that beggars must not be choosers. Lucky for your daughter if she obtains employment in a small theatre where only comedy is



played.<sup>1</sup> But the chances are against her, and she will be compelled to take the first engagement that offers itself, which will probably be at some large theatre where there is employment for any number of extra ladies, and where the salaries are really very good, if your daughter is only showy enough to make herself an attraction. You ask "what sort of attraction?" Well, have you any objection to her appearing as a page in an extravaganza? Consider that anyone who plays Shakespeare's heroines, Viola or Rosalind, must wear much the same costume; but the other ladies who play pages, and some of whom will be her companions in the dressing-room, are they just the sort of girls you would like your daughter to be with every evening of her life? If your well-brought-up daughter does go there one of two things will happen,—she will be either so thoroughly disgusted at all she hears and sees that she will never go near the place after the first week, or she will unconsciously deteriorate in tone, until the fixed lines of the moral boundary have become blurred and faint. If among these surroundings a girl remain pure in heart, it is simply nothing short of a miracle of grace. Would you like to expose your daughter to this atmosphere? Of course not. How can I put the question? but I *do* put the question, after giving you the information of the facts of the case. Even in a first-class theatre, for a Shakespearian revival, there must be a large number of all sorts engaged, and with them your daughter, as a beginner, will have to consort, and she cannot have her mother always at her elbow. Besides, her mother cannot neglect her other daughters, or her household duties, to attend to the youthful actress.

Now supposing a young lady at once obtains an engagement at a reputable theatre, and is cast for a good part. What then? Then the atmosphere of the theatre at its best is not a pleasant one. Your daughter will be astonished at the extraordinary variations of manner, from the abjectly servile to the free-and-easy, described in Mr. Namby's case as "Botany Bay gentility." She will hear everybody "my dearing" one another. At first she will not understand half that is said, and very little that is meant. When they all warm to their work, the veneer of politeness is soon rubbed off, and actor and actress are seen as the real artistes they are. The stage manager comes out strongly too; strange words are used, and whether it be high art or not that is being illustrated, there is pretty sure to be a considerable amount of forcible language employed in the excitement of the moment. Your daughter's ideas of propriety

(1) The process of obtaining an engagement is the same for a lady as a gentleman, i.e. a visit to an agent's office, &c., &c. Here is an advertisement which evidently offers a rare chance:—

"Wanted, ladies of attractive appearance, with good singing voices. Can be received for long pantomime season. Dresses found. Salaried engagement (an unexceptionable opportunity for clever amateurs desirous of adopting the profession)."

will be rudely shocked at every turn. When she ceases to be even astonished, she will be unconsciously deteriorating.

There is one sort of girl to whom all this does no harm, and that is the girl who comes of a hard-working professional theatrical family, who has been decently brought up in the middle of it all from a child, whose father and mother are in the theatre, thoroughly respectable people, and as careful of their daughter's morals as though she were the niece of a bishop. Such a girl as this, if she remain on the stage, will be a tolerable actress, always sure of an engagement. She will marry a decent, respectable actor, or someone connected with theatricals, will bring up a family excellently, will be really religious without ostentation, will never lose her self-respect, and in her own way be perfectly domesticated, happy, and contented. Or she may marry some one in a good social position: if so, she will quit the stage without regret, because she is not of the stuff of which great actresses are made; but she will look back on her theatrical experience with affection for her parents to whom she owed so much. She is neither Esther, nor Polly Eccles, nor is she in the position of the well-brought-up young lady we have been considering. But she is an admirable woman, in whatever station of life her lot may be cast, and not a bit of a snob.

For a young lady, travelling with a company would be simply impossible, unless accompanied by her mother, or by some trustworthy relative. A manageress might undertake the guardianship, and execute the trust conscientiously. But this is an exceptional case.

There is another point, and a very important one, to be considered, and that is the artistic temperament. If a young lady of attractive personal appearance possesses histrionic talent, then in proportion to her talent will be her temperament. She will be impulsive, passionate, impressionable, self-willed, impatient of control, simple, confiding, and vain, but artistically vain, and desirous of applause. She will be illogical, inconsistent, full of contradictions, fond of variety, and unable to exist without excitement. It only requires her to be a genius to be duped by the first schemer that throws himself in her way.

So, when the theatrical profession is brought before you, my dear madam, as a calling for your daughter to follow, you see that on the one hand there is mediocrity and deterioration of character, and on the other success, at, probably, a ruinous price. This does not apply, and again I impress it on my readers, to those who are to the manner born. They will lead jog-trot lives, study their parts, make puddings, act mechanically every night, knit socks in the green-room, and be virtuous and happy to the end of their days. Their artistic temperament will not lead them very far astray, unless they have the *feu sacré*, and then, it is likely, they will make a hasty marriage, repent at

leisure, and try to forget they ever bore a husband's name by making one for themselves. In some recent French romance an ex-actress is warning her daughter, who has married a prince, against the fascinations of a young painter. The princess turns on her mother with, "Est-ce ma faute à moi si j'ai dans les veines du sang d'artiste?" And the ex-comédienne feels the full force of her daughter's retort, which has in it a certain amount of truth. Public life has great dangers for young women of the artistic temperament: mothers cannot be always with them, and sheep-dogs are expensive and untrustworthy. Chance or ill-luck may bring your daughter, madam, to the stage, but you would not choose it for her, that is, the stage being as it is, and as it is likely to be, under the present conditions. When those conditions are altered for the better, it will be time enough for society to change its opinion on the subject,

But, it is urged, the present state of the stage is a vast improvement on the past; that the actor is a person of more consideration than formerly, and not necessarily tabooed from all society, but on the contrary, he is to be met in the very best drawing-rooms. It may be that a few, whom you may count on the fingers of both hands, have the *entrée* to the best society. It may be so; I am not in a position to deny it. But their genius, or talent, and their unblemished reputation have combined to place them on that pedestal exalted above their fellows. But was it not always so? Have there not always been a privileged few among the actors, as among other citizens of the Great Republic of Art and Letters, who have been admitted to the assemblies of the great, and whose hospitality the great have condescended to accept in return? Go back thirty years and at least a dozen names of prominent actors and actresses will occur to us as having been received in the best society. Now, in their time, the number of West-end theatres was about one-third of what it is at the present day. Therefore, if five actors were received by society then, there should be fifteen received now. If there are not, the stage of to-day is socially on the same level with the stage of thirty years ago, and has not advanced a step; if the number of presentable actors is, nowadays, less, then the stage has retrograded. I cannot make out that there are more received than formerly. There are a few University men on the stage, men of birth and education, entitled to be received in good society. But now we are speaking of only a section of society, and are begging the original question.

And why, from the nature of the case, cannot the stage ever rank with the recognised professions? Because, as a means of earning a livelihood, that is as a mere employment, the stage is open to all the world. Unlike painting, literature, and music, it requires no special knowledge of any sort; it can be practised as well by the

unlearned as, though not with the same facility, by the learned. It is a self-educating profession. Physical gifts, up to a certain point, will make up for deficiency in talent: but given talent, and with perseverance and application even for the most illiterate, success is certain. Given genius, then "reading and writing" seem to "come by nature," and though there may always be a little difficulty with the spelling, yet triumph is sure and swift. The stage requires no matriculation; but for an actor of talent, who loves his art, there is no limit to his studies,—one helps another, one leads to another. As far as society is concerned, there should be no one more thoroughly qualified to play a leading part in the very highest, the most intellectual, and most cultivated society, than the actor, or actress, who is rising in or who has reached the summit of "the profession." Scarcely a subject can be named that is not, in its degree, almost essential—a strong word, but on consideration used correctly—to the perfection of the actor's art. A first-rate actor should be an admirable Crichton. The best preparation for the stage is, as I have elsewhere insisted, a thorough education. True, that it is so for every calling, but especially for the stage. To belong to the bar of England is an honour in itself, even though the barrister never gets a brief and could do nothing with it if he did. To belong to the stage of England is *not* an honour in itself. To the genius, the talents, and the private worth of our eminent actors in the past and in the present, our stage owes its lustre. They owed nothing to the stage, the stage everything to them.

The desire to raise the social status of the actor so that the term actor shall be "synonymous with gentleman," is worthy of all praise. To make it possible for young ladies of education to take to acting as a means of earning a livelihood, would be a great social benefit.

When a youth, well brought up, takes to the stage, he should not be immediately treated as a pariah. On the contrary, if ever there be a time in a young man's career when, more than ever, he stands in need of good home traditions, the companionship of his equals, and the encouragement of his superiors, it is when he has honestly chosen, as a means of earning his living, the stage as a profession. That, for evident reasons, it has been usually selected by the dissolute, the idle, and those to whom any restraint is distasteful, accounts to a great extent for the disrepute in which the stage has been held. Of course the statute-book and the puritanism of the seventeenth century have much to answer for in the popular estimate of the players. There is a strong leaven of Puritanism amongst us, and, in some respects, so much the better; but also among very excellent people of various religious opinions, there has been, and it exists now, a sort of vague idea that the stage has always been under the positive ban of the Church. In the temporary laws and regulations of different

countries, enforced by narrow-minded men, civil or ecclesiastical, may be found the origin of this mistaken notion. The Church has never pronounced the stage the anathema. On the contrary, she has patronised the stage, and the first mimes who entered France from Italy rather resembled members of a religious order in their pious fervour, than actors of a later date in their laxity. If players were refused Christian burial, it was when they had neither lived nor died as even nominal Christians, and in such cases even "maimed rites" would savour of hypocrisy. In France the actors themselves were under this hallucination. M. Régnier tells us how in 1848 a deputation of comedians went to Monseigneur Affre to ask him to get the sentence of excommunication removed from the theatrical profession. "L'illustre prélat leur répondit qu'il n'y avait pas à la lever, parcequ'elle n'avait jamais été formulée, et que les comédiens français, comme les comédiens de tous les autres pays catholiques, pouvaient participer aux sacrements."

It would be a comparatively easy task to trace the origin of this floating but perfectly false tradition, but I have already overrun the limit of this article. In the time of Louis XIII. the actors were excellent church-goers, had their children baptised, frequented the sacraments, and were on the best terms with curés of Paris; and it will be a consolation to those actors among us who, like the doll in the song, "pine for higher society," to be reminded, that the grand monarch himself did not disdain to stand god-father at the font to the first-born of Molière, and to do the like office to the third child of Domenico Biancolelli, the Italian harlequin.

Our leading actors and actresses of the present day will naturally strive, no less than those of the past, to do their best for the stage, and, in return, the patrons of the drama will do their best for them. But to claim for it, as its right, the social status of the recognised professions, and to be fussily indignant with society at large for refusing to acknowledge this groundless claim, is degrading to an art which should be as independent, and as exalted, as virtue, and content with virtue's reward.

F. C. BURNAND.

## EDUCATION FOR THE HUNGRY.

MOST of those interested in elementary education are agreed that Mr. Mundella, before resting from his task of giving enlightenment to the poor, has yet two questions further to study—irregularity of attendance among the scholars, and destitution. The code is pretty nearly perfected. The conditions for its application leave room for improvement. A short time ago I had occasion to pass through a poor street under the very shadow of an Islington Board School: the hour was three in the afternoon. At most of the doors were women, come out to enjoy a chat in the fresh air; and playing in the street and on the steps were many children, of ages ranging from a year to fourteen. The street was a short one, but there were more than twenty children above five thus disporting themselves. After passing along in front of these houses I stopped to speak to a policeman about the matter, and learnt that so far as his experience went this state of things was quite normal in the neighbourhood. While the policeman and I conversed, however, the appearance of the street altered very rapidly. A few gestures on our part had shown the mothers that we were talking of the children; and within five minutes there was not a child to be seen. The women feared that the result of our talk might be that the official visitor would come round, and all their little ones be dispatched forthwith to the place provided for them by law—the Board School. Such a case as this is the staple grievance of all elementary head masters and head mistresses. “Enforce regularity of attendance better,” say many of them, “and the grumbling about over-pressure will entirely cease, so far as it relates to the pupils.”

But there is the other important circumstance militating against the success of our elementary teachers—destitution; the destitution existing even among children who attend school regularly. This is a matter to which, until lately, but scant attention of any definite sort has been given. All through the working of such a gigantic scheme as that for our national education, the difference among classes of population forms a most disturbing element in calculations. For instance, the child in a fine sixpenny or eightpenny school, coming from a home presided over by parents of very tolerable education, has a Standard I. reading book put into its hands. And in a Shoreditch penny school a labourer's child of the same age is set to work over the same book. The former of these children, in its father's house, enjoys the run of a conversational vocabulary amounting to over two thousand words. The labourer's child, from year's end to year's end,

hears the changes rung on no more than five hundred words, and many of these such as a lexicographer would be loth to include in any dictionary. Is it difficult to see which of these little ones will find most stumbling-blocks in the reading-book? Yet they must each do the same work with it, and must pass pretty much the same examination upon it. In the same way, an upper standard girl in a better class school may go back from the care of her mistress to that of a well-to-do mother who superintends her home lessons, while an upper standard girl in a poor neighbourhood has too often, after leaving school, toeke out the family's income by selling matches or papers in the streets. The better class girl comes in the morning from a comfortable bed in a comfortable bedroom; the match-girl sleeps on a mat spread on the floor of a room in which the whole family of seven abides. It is often our boast that we have one law for rich and poor. It would almost seem a pity that in regard to the young we had not two laws, one for the well-to-do, the other for the poor.

A little friend of mine, Ellen M——, aged nine, attends Golden Lane Board School, Barbican. She is a particularly intelligent child, and does well in the sight of her mistress. I asked her, at the school one day, whether she had had any breakfast, and she at once answered in a contented manner that she had. What had the breakfast been? Bread. Any tea or butter? No, only dry bread. On inquiry right through the class of which this little girl was a member, I found some who had had no breakfast at all. The great majority had made their meal of dry bread; a few had enjoyed tea or butter in addition; and three had been indulged with either bacon or fish. The head mistress was good enough to put questions to all her pupils, and obtained confessions from eight that they had come to school absolutely breakfastless, while it appeared that six had been dinnerless on the previous day. This result, however, did not represent the full truth. The girls were overcome with a little panic, did not know why the questions were put, and many were ashamed to let their little neighbours know the true state of matters. Eighty-one of the girls came from families each of which lives in one room only. The total attendance was 144. Ellen M—— told me she lived at No. 2, Honduras Street, and gave the following account of the population of that house. Ground floor, man and wife and two children in front room; three children of same family in back room. First floor, man and wife in front room; man and wife and two children in back room. Second floor, man and wife and five children in front room; a woman and her daughter in the back room. Top floor, man and wife and five children in front room; "a young lady" in back room. My informant added that she and her sister often slept upstairs with the young lady.

Reaching No. 2, Honduras Street—this was in July last—I asked a

woman on the stairs if Mrs. M—— lived there. "I am what is left of her," was the reply. The poor woman did indeed look emaciated. When able to work she did charring, but pleurisy had for some months been hanging about her. Her husband was by trade a skin-dresser, but he was out of work; even had work been offered him he could not have accepted it, as an abscess had formed under his right arm. Entering Mrs. M——'s room, I found it almost destitute of furniture. Want seemed to have swept away all the poor comforts of humble life, yet the woman, her age about thirty-five, scarcely grumbled at her lot. "They say," was her remark, "that when poverty comes in at the door, love flies out at the window, but I and my husband have always got along well together. Thank God, he never lifted his hand to me, or did an unkind thing." No appearance of dinner was on the table, although the elder children were expected home from school. A small piece of bread was all they were to receive. On the bed lay a baby asleep and almost naked. At first sight I imagined that it was affected by some frightful skin eruption, but closer inspection proved that every part of the body exposed was covered with flies, which on that scorching midsummer day crowded about the infant like vultures round a dead Parsee. Such was the abode from which came one of the best scholars of Golden Lane School. I examined every room in the house, finding extreme poverty and overcrowding everywhere. At the foot of the stairs the "young lady" was lolling about. It turned out that her profession was that of a feather-dresser, but she had not pursued this calling for some time. In answer to a query as to what she was then doing, the girl stared very boldly, and said, "Nothing." The whole of Honduras Street is full of homes similar to those in No. 2, and "young ladies" like the quondam feather-dresser are far from unknown. In a neighbouring district I came upon the case of a little schoolgirl who had no father. Asked what her mother did, she replied that her mother was ill and could do nothing. Had she any big brothers? No. Big sisters? One. What did the big sister do? The little girl did not know precisely; she stayed at home all day, but went out to work at night; and it was she who kept the family.

Probably it will not be very long ere the London School Board orders a return to be made showing the proportion, among its half million scholars, of children habitually under-fed. During this summer I was led to try and find out how many children under the Board had their fees remitted, and how many had parents in receipt of out-door relief. It is manifest that both these large classes of scholars must be chiefly composed of badly-nourished children. On inquiry at the Board's offices, however, I was informed that returns upon the former of the two points were in preparation. On the



latter point there was no existing statement of a complete character. I then began, in a humble way, to sample a few representative schools for myself. A series of questions addressed to about twenty head masters brought me courteous replies of a very interesting kind. From those replies I select figures returned from three well-known schools.

#### REGENT STREET SCHOOL, DEPTFORD.

DEPARTMENT.	No. Present.	No Breakfast July 2, 1884.	No Dinner on previous Day.	No. with Fathers un- employed.	Members of Families each occupying one Room only.
Boys . . . .	240	24	30	48	34
Girls . . . .	230	22	36	59	37
Infants . . .	360	18	17	32	29
Totals . . .	730	64	73	179	100

#### TOWER STREET SCHOOL, SEVEN DIALS.

DEPARTMENT.	No. Present.	No Breakfast July 2, 1884.	No Dinner on previous Day.	No. with Fathers un- employed.	Members of Families each occupying one Room only.
Boys . . . .	235	46	29	52	132
Girls . . . .	202	25	23	69	93
Infants . . .	202	5	7	14	23
Totals . . .	639	76	59	132	298

#### DRURY LANE SCHOOL.

DEPARTMENT.	No. Present.	No Breakfast July 2, 1884.	No Dinner on previous Day.	No. with Fathers un- employed.	Members of Families each occupying one Room only.
Boys . . . .	250	39	35	48	119
Girls . . . .	198	8	17	68	92
Infants . . .	153	4	6	9	52
Totals . . .	601	51	58	123	263

These are poor schools, but there are several other schools under the Board—Lant Street, Orange Street, Saffron Hill, Collingwood Street,

St. John's Lane, for instance—quite as poor, and many only a little better. I will not pretend that the figures just quoted are strictly accurate, though they will suggest to some a curious harmony with statistics gathered from other schools by an able Inspector of Schools, Mr. Marchant Williams. It must be manifest that when catechized on such points, some of the children, particularly the infants, would give misleading answers. It may, however, be said that the figures are probably under the mark rather than over it; the children, as has been already remarked, are naturally shy of exposing their extreme poverty. Further, these statistics were gathered in the height of summer, when destitution is at its minimum. I have often heard a master or mistress ask children whether they generally had a good breakfast, and receive an affirmative reply, while teachers would assure me that they had dry bread at the most, and often nothing at all. One little boy at Saffron Hill told me he had had a very good breakfast; and questions elicited the fact that this consisted of a piece of raw haddock. At Gifford Street Board School, a little girl asserted that she had had "such a fine dinner!" and her explanation to the teacher was this: "Well, mum, I had a whole ha'porth of rice to myself, and my two big sisters had only a ha'porth between them." Many cases like these could be enumerated. In all the schools, such as those named in the foregoing tables, fully forty per cent. of the children get nothing but dry bread at any meal, except, perhaps, occasionally on Sundays; and fully twenty per cent. more get, in addition, only a little tea and butter.

Such a state of matters cries for remedy. Whether these children are to be educated or not, they should be fed. But the attempt to cram them with knowledge, while they are more or less starving, is to give a very curious rendering of the beatitude, "Blessed are the hungry, for they shall be filled."

Those who interest themselves in the problem furnished by these poor children, perceive that they will always be divided into two classes, demanding widely different treatment. There are the children whose parents can provide them with no regular support of any kind, and who often depend on chance entirely for the day's food. Such are many of the children whose fees are remitted, or whose parents are in receipt of out-door relief. Then there are the children whose parents, though poor, are able to make some regular provision for the welfare of their offspring, though this provision is often far from adequate. The former class must always depend on pure charity. The Society which, under the presidency of the Earl of Shaftesbury, purveys "Dinners for Destitute Children," has for a considerable period been doing work for these particularly hungry little ones. Anybody who cares to inspect the work carried out by this association in such a place as Fox Court Ragged School, will find that the opera-

tions include, not only dinners, but bread-and-milk breakfasts for the very young. The dinners are such as are given at most ordinary soup kitchens. A scheme more specially devoted to the furtherance of school work, however, was started in 1883, under the title of "The Board School Children's Free Dinner Fund." This is generally called "Mrs. Pennington's Fund," from the initiatory zeal and continual interest that lady exhibited in connection with the movement. The dinners were commenced in a small mission room near Edgware Road, where some seventy children were fed. Subsequently, arrangements were made for giving dinners to the hungry pupils of three neighbouring Board Schools, and in a larger hall in Omega Place, Alpha Road, an average number of three hundred and forty children per week have been fed. The scheme has flourished. The Rev. E. Canney, so well known in connection with the "Children's Fresh Air Mission," obtained the assistance of Mrs. Pennington's Committee in establishing similar tables in the Saffron Hill district. Then the Vicar of St. Michael's followed suit, in the Strand. And there are now additional branches in Clerkenwell, Stepney, and Shadwell. At each of these centres the same kind of feeding is adopted. Victor Hugo's experience is that a good dinner, given once a fortnight to starving children, is in itself sufficient to strengthen their constitutions against the inroads of ordinary diseases. Mrs. Pennington distributes her meals oftener than this. Twice a week—in one or two districts thrice a week—her ragged pets are treated to a dinner, consisting of joints of meat, beef-steak puddings, and meat stews, with rice pudding, suet pudding, and vegetables—sometimes fruit. The recipients of these substantial meals are generally recommended by the school-teacher, and each child, as a rule, obtains a place at the table for a month, and then gives way in favour of some other young one waiting to be fed up. Two or three of these good meals make a marvellous difference on the hungry little folk. At the Rev. Mr. Rose's table in Clerkenwell, I have seen new-comers stealing in and sitting down with vacant expressions on their pallid faces, showing that they were actually past hunger. Silent and listless before the meal, they would be merrily chatting with their neighbours as it concluded. "Oh, my!" said one of Mrs. Rose's little girls, as she passed her hands over her chest; "this meat does make me feel so happy!" This material happiness is conveyed to the starving at the cost of fivepence per head for each meal.

That these free dinners improve the physical condition of the children very markedly, is a fact beyond doubt. The only thing to guard against in connection with this scheme is the danger that teachers or voluntary visitors working for it may be occasionally imposed upon, and may be led to extend charity to the undeserving. Indeed, according to what may be called the strict political economy of

charity, the scheme cannot fail to encourage a dangerous principle, by favouring undeserving parents through deserving children. The principle is dangerous: let it be admitted. Yet there will long continue to be many who, at sight of a little child half dead with starvation, will be unable to vanquish their bowels of compassion by logic.

Mrs. Pennington's scheme, then, is excellent so far as it goes, but it only provides relief of a more or less temporary character; and it is not designed for helping those who can help themselves a little. A widow washerwoman, for instance, out at work all day, might be willing to afford her two children a little money for dinner, if she could rely on their not spending it in the sweet-shops. Or a sempstress might be willing to do the same rather than relinquish the time requisite for the preparation of a hot meal. Especially would this be the case if the children were able to procure dinners at a cheap rate for their parents as well as themselves. These are the little folk who present the second portion of our problem, and their cases have already been earnestly studied. At the Stanley Arms Coffee Palace in Seven Dials, and at various other places of the kind, systems were introduced more than a year ago by which school children can buy tickets entitling them to food costing more than the price of their tickets. More thorough work, however, has been attempted, and the first distinct success has been attained at a soup kitchen connected with the Columbia Market estate in Shoreditch. There are but two articles of food offered in this really wonderful institution—soup and bread. A half-pint of strong soup is sold for a halfpenny. Customers may bring their own bread, or they may buy eight ounces of the best for a halfpenny. Dishes and spoons are provided free, and a most important feature in the arrangements is this: that if three or four people choose to share a pennyworth of soup, they will all be cheerfully supplied with plates and spoons. This privilege is largely used. Quantities of soup are served in pennyworths also to outsiders, and the poverty of the district is shown by the fact that sometimes the same jug will come back time after time in an afternoon, until the necessities of nearly a dozen families living in the same court have been supplied. This soup kitchen further increases its usefulness by sending out hot soup in large milk cans to schools. For instance, the Vicar of St. John's, Cambridge Heath, takes twenty-five gallons of soup in this way every week for his church schools. The Congregational Schools in Old Street take eighteen gallons a week. Mr. McLaren, who superintends this kitchen, unites enthusiasm with practical sense in an admirable degree, and the triumphant result of his efforts is that his scheme is self-supporting. One reservation upon this statement must be made—the premises in which the kitchen is carried on are lent; however, half of the other soup kitchens are carried on under similar advantages, and in Mr. McLaren's case rent

also could be afforded, while yet a profit would remain. This kitchen began in 1880, and in the season 1880-81, 42,819 pints of soup were sold. In the following year pretty much the same results were obtained. In 1882-83, 62,386 pints were disposed of, and last winter, during a season of 165 days, the sales rose to 113,205 pints. It will be seen from this that in any poor district of large extent a soup kitchen may be made self-supporting and eminently useful. And smaller districts, within easy distance of each other, could combine to support one central soup kitchen of the kind, which could send out cooked material ready for distribution.

An experiment on a more limited scale was begun last spring by Mr. S. D. Fuller, at Gifford Street Board School, Islington. Obtaining the loan of a mission hall in the neighbourhood, this gentleman set himself to find out, first, whether a sufficiently nourishing meal for one day could be given to a child at the cost of something under a penny for raw materials; and, secondly, whether it was possible to build up a children's dinner-trade sufficient to pay all expenses. Through the aid of Dr. Benjamin Richardson, Mr. Fuller was able to solve the first part of his problem to his own satisfaction. For a penny a child attending the Gifford Street Mission Hall may obtain half an ounce of bread with three-quarters of a pint of soup, and another half-ounce of bread with jam; or it may have two large slices of bread with bacon between, and bread and jam to follow. The dinners at Gifford Street are still flourishing, with an average attendance of nearly two hundred. "You would be surprised," said one of the Gifford Street masters to me, "at the almost instantaneous effect these dinners have in many cases. Now here is a boy who has for the last two years behaved in the best of manners, and even got through his lessons creditably. But he was too weak and too timid; anybody could see he was half starved, and lacked vitality. As soon as he had eaten the very first dinner he had at the mission hall I saw him commence to hit his neighbour over the head with a spoon. I was delighted!"

Almost contemporaneously with Mr. Fuller's experiment, Mr. Bousfield, of the London School Board, began penny dinners for school children at the World's End, Chelsea. Here results of the most interesting and encouraging kind have been reached. Two capable ladies, Miss Grogan and Miss Ewbank, brought into perfect order a system which made itself absolutely self-supporting. Indeed, at Chelsea, the problem of self-supporting penny dinners may be said to have been first solved. True, quite recent experience in connection with this centre have not been so encouraging. But it is confidently expected that the falling off of attendances at this dinner will be remedied ere long. From World's End, Mr. Bousfield has removed his apparatus to Cook's Ground School, Chelsea.

Mr. Fuller and Mr. Bousfield, in their experiments, have largely benefited from still earlier caterers for hungry little ones—Sir Henry Peek, whose Rousdon system is now famous, and the Rev. Moore Ede, whose energetic and scientific solution of the feeding problem at Gateshead has lately called forth high eulogy from Mr. Mundella. The two London gentlemen, in their turn, have been copied by philanthropic school managers in various quarters of the metropolis. There are about twenty penny dinner centres now actively at work in London, and as many more about to begin. Of the schemes at work, one of the best is undoubtedly that at Hornsey Road, where capital food from a varied *menu* is daily provided, on the calculation that an average attendance of one hundred customers will clear all expenses. Probably, however, Lady Colin Campbell outstrips all London competitors. Lady Colin Campbell, at Great Saffron Hill, has triumphantly established a system of penny dinners that includes ox-head soup, pea soup, pease pudding, lentil soup, fig pudding, raisin pudding, and meat roly-poly pudding; and an average of fifty customers pays expenses, although each diner is entitled to more than one helping. Mr. Moore Ede, it may be noted, is also able to make an average of fifty suffice to support a centre. In London, certain of the experiments have been failures. This is natural. But at the important conference held at the Society of Arts, Hull, in the beginning of last month, provisions were made for the guidance of all local dinner schemes in the metropolis by a central council of well-known individuals, nearly all of whom are school managers. Mr. Fuller has been appropriately elected chairman of the council. Mr. Forbes-Clarke is the energetic secretary. Any body of local school managers applying to this council will be assisted in every way to make a fair trial of a penny dinner scheme, on the general calculation that the cost of apparatus required to start with will range from £10 to £15. In most districts a mission hall or some place of the kind can be had as a dining room, either gratuitously or for a rent of about five shillings a week. The cook is paid out of the pence taken from the children. General superintendence can be counted on from ladies living in the district, and this superintendence would, of course, be given free.

This Penny Dinner Council, therefore, acting as a sort of branch for the Central Committee of Board School Managers, has plenty of honourable work before it. During this winter it will be gathering experience from over fifty simultaneous experiments in London alone, and its movements will be watched by many provincial friends of the poor. It is satisfactory to know that the members of the London School Board are exhibiting a very kindly interest in the dinner movement; and Mr. Mundella himself has associated himself heartily with it. The Council, it is to be hoped, will keep in mind that the

right class of scholars to study first is composed solely of those who are able and willing to pay for the dinners. As many dinner centres should be established as possible, where only genuine paying customers would be dealt with. Of course all and sundry who come to a centre and paid pence for portions to take away would be *bona-fide* customers. Further, I shall presume to hint that when two or more children wished to combine in buying a single pennyworth of food they should be allowed to purchase it, and should be provided with the means of consuming it with comfort. And again, children might be allowed to bring their own bread—there is generally a spare crust at home, however hard—and buy halfpennyworths of soup to take with it. The number of probable paying customers once ascertained and their wants once provided for, the still more difficult task of dealing with the habitually hungry and copperless children will have to be faced. Possibly the future may evolve some industrial scheme by which such poor children, before or after school hours, may work out the value of a daily dinner. Why should not some of them, for instance, take a part in keeping the schools clean? One thing is plain, the Council is bent on admitting to its projects as little of the pauperising element as possible. Mrs. Pennington and her ways will never do for the Council. Let it, then, in pursuance of its programme, go on unto the perfection of a method by which each of the thousands of starving children in London may be enabled to get at least a portion of bread daily, and have the piece with honour. Count Rumford, fed multitudes of grown men and women in Bavaria at a penny a head. Mr. Smith is doing the same in Sweden. Mr. Moore Ede does it at Gateshead, and his feeding establishments are self-supporting. Surely, then, we may hope that the penny-dinner movement will ere long eclipse itself, and offer a sound dinner for a child for a halfpenny.

ERIC S. ROBERTSON.

## THE STATE OF THE TURF.

AMONG the many questions which occupy the minds of social reformers of the present day, the condition of the English turf has acquired an importance which may easily be underrated by those who, like the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis, do not appreciate or recognise the value to nations as well as individuals of their sports and pastimes; and the termination of another racing season appears to afford a favourable opportunity for directing attention to a subject which is regarded with increasing interest, though from very opposite points of view, by nearly all classes of the community. It is not my intention to trace the steps by which the sport of horseracing has, from very small beginnings, gradually but surely acquired its present position as a national institution. My object is to deal with the present and future rather than with the past, to consider the condition of the turf as it is now constituted, and to discuss the general features of its management and the rules and regulations under which it is at present conducted.

It is hardly necessary to explain, even to the uninitiated, that horseracing, properly so-called, is carried on in England under the exclusive management and authority of the Jockey Club—a self-elected body, unrecognised by law, and invested with no legal powers, yet wielding an authority of a most complete and autocratic character over the sport which its members have guided and controlled for generations. In order to show the character of the *personnel* of the tribunal in whom such unusual powers are vested, it may be explained that the club at present consists of some seventy members, exclusive of members of the royal family and honorary members. Fifty-seven of these are or have been members of either branch of the Legislature, twenty having held office as Ministers of the Crown. The legislative business of the club is carried on by three Stewards, of whom one retires annually, the new Steward being nominated by the retiring Steward, subject to the approbation of the Jockey Club at its general meeting. The rules of racing, which it is the duty of the Stewards to administer, were last revised in 1876, and apply to all meetings held under the control of the Jockey Club and duly advertised in the *Racing Calendar*. The Stewards have the power of appointing all the public officers and the servants of the Jockey Club, they have discretionary powers to warn any person off the racecourse at Newmarket or any premises belonging to the Jockey Club, and such sentences are extended to all other meetings held in England by the provisions contained in Rule 5 of the Rules of Racing, which enacts that Stewards of all meetings are to exclude



from places under their control every person who has been thus warned off Newmarket Heath, or whose name is in the Unpaid Forfeit List ; also every jockey who has been suspended for corrupt practices on the turf, so long as the sentence against such person or jockey remains in force.

The tendency of turf legislation during the past few years has been in the direction of extending the authority and strengthening the hold of the Stewards on the arrangement of race meetings, and the conditions under which those meetings are held. The most important of the more recent enactments in this direction has been the system of licensing officials of race meetings and jockeys, which has been gradually established by the Jockey Club, a system which has materially strengthened the hands of the Stewards in the exercise of their authority. Rule 8 provides that, "The following officials shall require a licence to be granted by the Stewards of the Jockey Club annually before they can act, viz. Judge, Starter, Clerk of the Course, Handicapper, and Clerk of the Scales, and one of each is to be named for each meeting advertised in the *Calendar*." These licences are granted only under conditions from time to time framed by the Stewards, and are forfeited at their discretion in cases of misconduct or infraction of the Rules of Racing. Thus the whole staff of officials of meetings throughout the country is brought under the authority and immediate supervision of the Stewards of the Jockey Club. In order to check as much as possible the undue clashing and multiplication of meetings, the Stewards supervise the arrangement of fixtures and dates at which the various meetings shall be held. It has been said that this duty is neglected by the authorities, and newspaper critics are unsparing in their denunciations of the Stewards of the Jockey Club for what they deem to be their failure in preventing the plethora of racing which they all profess to deplore. It will be an agreeable surprise to some of these gentlemen to learn that whereas in the year 1874, 1,873 races were contested by 1,965 horses, in the year 1884, 1,615 races were contested by 1,982 horses in Great Britain and Ireland. They will be glad to hear that whereas in 1874 races took place on 130 racecourses, in 1884 the number of these racecourses was reduced to 65 ; and their satisfaction will be further increased by the knowledge that 185 meetings were held in 1874, and only 136 in 1884. These statistics would appear to show that the efforts of the Stewards of the Jockey Club in the direction of limiting the undue multiplication of race meetings have not been entirely barren of good results. The Stewards have also the power of authorising or prohibiting the formation of new racecourses ; and they have of late exercised this power only after consultation with the local magistrates and municipal authorities, with a view to ascertain the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants on the subject. The

number of short races has also lately been limited under the rules of racing by Rule 4, sec. iii., which provides that "no meeting shall be advertised in the *Racing Calendar* unless the money added be not less than 300 sovs. per day, 150 of which at least shall be added to races of a mile and upwards; and at each meeting so advertised there shall be not less than two races per day of a mile or upwards, and of races confined to three year olds and upwards, not more than two per day of less than six furlongs." This is undoubtedly a step in the right direction, and it may be hoped that the Jockey Club will still further remodel the programmes of all meetings under their control by diminishing the number of "short-cut" races, which constitute so undesirable a feature in the racing of the present day.

It may be asked, what is the power with which the Stewards are armed for enforcing obedience to these rules and regulations? It is necessary to explain that under racing law the rules of the Jockey Club apply to all "recognised" meetings advertised in the *Racing Calendar*, which is published under the authority of the Jockey Club. The Stewards may, at their discretion, prohibit the advertisement of any meeting in the official *Racing Calendar*; and it is provided that "if a horse run in a race at any meeting in Great Britain which is not so advertised, he is perpetually disqualified for all races to which these rules apply." The result of this enactment is that, if the Stewards duly exercise the power vested in them, it is practically impossible for any owner or trainer of horses to disregard with impunity the recognised rules of racing. It may be conceived that an opposition might be organized, and that race meetings could be held without the authority of the Jockey Club and in disregard of the official rules, but it is difficult to believe that many owners of thoroughbred horses would be found willing to incur the pecuniary loss which would be the inevitable result of such action on their part. There is, however, a large class of meetings for steeplechasing and hurdle-racing held under the rules of the Grand National Hunt Club, and independently of the control of the Jockey Club, and it is very desirable that the former body should be incorporated with the latter, so that all racing in the kingdom should be governed by one paramount authority. Such a proposal was indeed brought latterly under the notice of the Jockey Club, but it was somewhat hastily and in my opinion unadvisedly rejected.

It will be seen from the above sketch of the position and powers of the Jockey Club, that their authority over flat racing in this country is practically complete, and amply adequate if properly exercised for the proper direction and management of all matters connected with the turf. No legally constituted authority could be endowed with more autocratic power than that now wielded by the Stewards of the Jockey Club. Their influence and authority is supported and limited

solely by the Jockey Club itself, with the general assent and support of the racing community—a support which they fully enjoy, and which it is reasonable to believe they would only forfeit in case of manifest dereliction of duty on their part. It has been said that an irresponsible body, constituted as the Jockey Club is, and unassisted by the authority or the sanction of the law, is inadequate for the purposes for which it exists. I confess it has always appeared to me that any interference by Act of Parliament, or by authorities deputed by Act of Parliament, would fail to secure as complete a control over the management of the turf as that which is now exercised by the Jockey Club through their Stewards. It is quite possible that magistrates and other local authorities might be made primarily responsible for the control of racing in their several districts; but their operations would be limited to the settlement of fixtures, the licensing of meetings, and the preservation of order by the local police. They would not have the technical knowledge necessary to qualify them to deal with the many and complex details involved in the management of the racing itself, over which a body such as the Jockey Club could alone exercise adequate authority and supervision. Thus there would be two possibly conflicting authorities responsible for the conduct of each race meeting; and the fact of the power of licensing meetings being taken away from the Jockey Club would diminish *pro tanto* their influence and authority in other matters of racing law over which they now exercise control. In my humble opinion very little would be gained, and much might be lost, by a change in the authority which has for so long presided over the fortunes of the sport.

Having thus briefly explained the authority under which and by which the turf is at present managed, let us consider how far the condition of the turf at the present time deserves the strictures which are passed upon it, not only by those who aim at little less than its entire abolition and destruction, but by many good and true sportsmen who have its interests at heart. No doubt the circumstances under which it is now carried on differ materially from those which prevailed in the days which an older generation can still remember, and which many look back to with regret. The enormous increase of the facilities for attending race meetings in the present day, enabling as they do vast crowds of every class of society to participate in the sport at a distance from their homes, has not only created a new order of things, but naturally calls for better and more stringent methods for enforcing regulations, for preserving order, and for controlling the masses who now congregate on our racecourses. The innovation which of late years has modified more materially than any other the character of the turf has been the rapid conversion of race meet-

ings from what have been termed "open meetings" into meetings held on enclosed grounds, to which a charge is made for admittance, and which are commonly known as "gate-money" meetings. There can be no doubt that the rapid increase in the number of these latter—and, it must be added, the importance which they have acquired—has wrought a considerable change in the character of racing generally during the last few years. There is much to be said against the encouragement of these gate-money speculations, and there is no doubt that racing when it could be freely enjoyed by all classes on an open racecourse realised more completely the idea of a national sport. I personally sympathise entirely with those who would afford every encouragement and support to well-managed old-fashioned meetings. The new system, however, will compare favourably in some respects with the old. Owners of horses are no longer satisfied with the prizes offered for competition at old-fashioned meetings, and the stakes must therefore be increased to thousands where hundreds used to attract large fields of horses. This demand cannot be satisfied by the managers of some of the old-fashioned meetings who have no entrance-money to apply to the increased added money required, and thus it comes to pass that open meetings are becoming more and more difficult to manage, and consequently less worthy of support and encouragement. These remarks do not of course apply to Epsom, Ascot, Doncaster, and other great open meetings, where large and important stakes are attractive enough to render a "gate" unnecessary.

It is said that the stakes advertised at gate-money meetings are too large; but I have never heard any satisfactory argument in support of this complaint, except that the multiplication of these tempting offers may lead owners to overtax the constitution of their horses. On the other hand, if the theory that supply generally meets demand may be considered to apply in this case, the prizes alluded to may do much to encourage the breeding of thoroughbred stock—one of the main results, if not the sole object, of horseracing. We are also frequently told that these large stakes now advertised are objectionable and even fraudulent, because they are partly made up by subscriptions from the owners of horses engaged in them. The truth of the matter is, that when a clerk of the course advertises a stake of £1,000 by a subscription of £25 or £10 each, he merely *guarantees* the payment of the whole £1,000 advertised, while the owner on his part agrees, when he enters for the race, to pay the £25 or any other sum which he may be required to pay under the conditions of the race. If he chooses to risk £25 for the sake of winning £1,000, he does so with a full knowledge of the conditions under which he subscribes; and it is difficult to

see how the argument of fraud can be sustained on the ground that the £1,000 comes partly out of the pockets of owners, instead of entirely out of the fund of the race meeting at which the stake is run for. The conditions under which the stake is guaranteed are plainly set forth in the advertisement in the official *Calendar*, and as they can under no circumstances be subsequently added to or modified, the grievance alluded to is surely rather imaginary. It should be remembered that inasmuch as under the regulations of the Jockey Club the accounts of these racecourse companies are to be annually audited, and any sum after payment to the shareholders of ten per cent. dividend is to be added to the race fund, the rapacity of clerks of the course is not unchecked, while the money forthcoming for racing and for its proper management is annually increased. As to the argument that racing should be provided gratuitously for the multitude, it is enough to say that such a demand has never been advanced in connection with any other pleasure sport or pastime. On the whole, I think I have shown that the new gate-money meetings are calculated, if properly controlled, to contribute to the increased prosperity and welfare of racing generally. The large sums of money which are paid for the privilege of entrance into their enclosures, while no doubt contributing to swell the dividends of the shareholders, enable them to provide funds whereby not only are large stakes given for the encouragement of racing, but the executive are enabled to provide an adequate staff of officials and police for the good conduct and better regulation of the stands and enclosures, the bad management of which at the old-fashioned and poverty-stricken meetings was often a standing reproach to races held under the old system.

Having examined the conditions under which race meetings are now held, let us consider the character of the races themselves. They may be roughly classified under three heads: viz. "weight-for-age" races, in which, as the name implies, horses carry weights which are fixed by the rules of racing to be carried by horses according to their age, subject only in some cases to the addition of penalties for having previously won races or of "maiden allowances" for horses who have never been so successful. This class of race requires no explanation and no remark. It provides obviously the best class of racing, it is less open than others to abuse, and offers less encouragement to those who race for mere pecuniary profit. All our so-called "classic" races are of this character, and it would be well for the best interests of the turf if racing could be restricted to this kind of contest. But that is unfortunately impossible, and the second class of racing, viz. "handicaps," in which the weights to be carried by horses are arbitrarily apportioned by racing officials in accordance with the supposed merits of each animal,

constitutes it is to be feared by far the largest and most popular element of modern racing. It is useless to argue against handicaps or to suggest their abolition. It is sufficient to say that they are an inevitable development of the sport, and that our efforts in the direction of limiting the evil influence they undoubtedly exercise on the morality of the racing community must be limited to careful supervision, facilitated as it now is by the new provision quoted above, under which all handicappers require a licence from the Jockey Club, which they only hold *dum bene se gesserint*.

There is, however, a third class of race which, in my opinion, is more capable of being used solely for gambling purposes, and more liable to be subject to "arrangement" by unscrupulous owners, than any other; I refer to what are called "selling races." These races were originally instituted simply to facilitate the sale of horses. A horse is entered in a selling race under the following conditions: that if he wins he is "liable either to be claimed for the selling price, or if it is a condition of the race that the winner is to be sold by auction, he is to be sold immediately after the race, and the surplus of the selling price is to be divided between the owner of the second horse and the race fund of the meeting." If the horse runs but does not win, he is liable to be "claimed for the advertised selling price and the amount of the stakes or plate by the owners of horses running in the race." (*v.* Rule 41.) The limit of the lowest selling price is fixed at fifty sovs. The horses running in these races carry weight for age, but conditions are frequently added of penalties and allowances, by which horses running *not to be sold* carry extra weight, and horses entered to be sold for less than the advertised price carry less weight, in a sliding scale. Thus an owner can run a horse worth, say, 1,000 sovs. to be sold either for that price or not to be sold, in which case he would carry 14 lbs. extra; or for 400 sovs., when he would carry 8 lbs. less than his original weight; or for 200 sovs., when he would carry 12 lbs. less; and the owner thus enjoys the inestimable privilege of handicapping his own horse. It was soon seen by clever owners that if a horse of the value of 1,000 sovs. could be thus entered in those races to be sold for 200, he would carry such a weight as would convert the probability of his winning almost into a certainty. So much has this been found to be the case, that it is frequently stated that such and such a horse will win such and such a selling race before the entries are even made.

It should be explained that the principle on which an owner makes this business profitable is that he bets so largely on the race that he is enabled if he wins to "buy in" his horse for any sum beyond the £200 which he may fetch at auction, and still secure a handsome profit over and above the extra price which he thus has to pay to buy back his horse, the result being that he wins a fair stake

of money and retains his horse, to repeat the experiment perhaps within a very few days; and the betting man, or "plunger," thus has a distinct advantage in this kind of race over the more prudent and less gambling owner. It is obvious that races held under such conditions as these must lead to a system of racing which is nothing more or less than sheer gambling, and inasmuch as most of these races are entered for on the night before they are run, the owners present with their horses at race meetings have peculiar facilities for "arranging" these races with some approximation to certainty. They are therefore not only objectionable in their very nature, but they do more than any other class of race to encourage excessive gambling and betting, which, as everybody knows, is the origin of all the evils which endanger the prosperity and welfare of the turf. If it is considered necessary that selling races should be tolerated—and they are so profitable to race funds that it is probably impossible to abolish them—I would suggest that their conditions should be modified in the following manner: (1) their number should certainly be limited—say to two in each day's racing; (2) no horse should be allowed to be entered in a selling race (except perhaps in Ireland!) *not to be sold*; (3) horses in each selling race should all be entered to be sold for the same sum; and (4) the conditions contained in the French racing rules should be enforced, viz. that every horse entered for a selling race should be liable to be claimed *previous* to the race in the same manner and upon the same conditions as after it is run; and, lastly, all "selling handicaps" should be abolished. I believe that by carrying out the above changes the Jockey Club would not only put a stop to many growing evils, but would take a step which would to a great extent purify and improve the general character of racing.

But whatever may be the evils and malpractices which disgrace the turf, and whatever form they may assume, it is impossible to ignore the fact that all the scandals and all the dishonesty which so seriously discredit it are traceable to one cause, namely the excessive and ever-increasing amount of betting, which causes so much misery and ruin to the thousands who now indulge in it. You may make what changes you please; you may transfer the management of racing from the hands of those who now control it to officials appointed by the Legislature; but unless some means are found for checking the unlimited facilities for and temptations to betting which modern science multiplies every day, all our efforts to purify the turf must be to a certain extent abortive.

The practice of betting on horseracing has spread to and infected all classes of the community; the whole country is flooded with touts, tipsters, and betting agents; and new methods are invented every day to those whose business it is to disseminate the temptation and invite

victims of all classes to enter the net so skilfully spread for them. Whether it will ever be possible to deal successfully with this gigantic evil it is not within my province to decide. The Legislature has made some attempts to deal with a vice which though it is not confined to horse-racing alone, supplies the speculator with the easiest and most popular opportunity for the exercise of his gambling propensities; it must be confessed, however that experience does not warrant us in anticipating much from parliamentary interference in mitigation of this great and increasing evil, of which none can fail to see around them the terrible results.

There is no class more injuriously affected by the practice of betting, and with worse results to themselves and the racing public, than the jockeys of the present day, although the Jockey Club has of late made an energetic attempt to grapple with the difficulty. It is impossible to enact a *rule of racing* to prevent jockeys betting; but the Stewards have now renewed the official notice which was issued last year, that they will make it a condition of the granting of the necessary licences to jockeys that if it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Stewards that any jockey has become involved in betting transactions, he shall be liable to immediate forfeiture of his licence. It was said at the time of the issue of this notice that it would probably be inoperative; and it is no doubt the fact that, while there can be little doubt that many of the leading jockeys of the day are known to risk in some instances considerable sums of money in betting, in no case has the commission of this offence as yet been proved to the satisfaction of the authorities. It should be remembered however that the Stewards of the Jockey Club labour under the serious difficulty that the evidence brought before them cannot be taken on oath; and it will be readily understood that, under these circumstances, the difficulty of obtaining satisfactory proof of the truth of charges and accusations, however openly made and generally believed, is very great. On the other hand the notice above referred to has made it clear to jockeys that if they engage largely in betting transactions, either directly in person or indirectly through the agency of their friends, they now do so at their own risk and peril. It is impossible to doubt that, difficult as it is to procure sufficient evidence, proofs will before long be forthcoming, and some signal example will be made of the offenders who have been encouraged to believe that they can with impunity set the regulations of the Stewards at defiance. Whenever an opportunity does occur of punishing a jockey for the infraction of the above salutary provision, I venture to express an earnest hope that the Stewards will include in that punishment, by summarily warning them off Newmarket Heath, all those who may be proved to have aided and tempted jockeys to the



commission of the offence, and who are often more to blame than the jockeys themselves.

Before I leave the subject of betting I should like to suggest that it would be very desirable that stewards and managers of race meetings all over the country should rigidly enforce the conditions published on their official race-cards, for the prohibition of *ready-money betting*. It would appear at first sight that this prohibition is indefensible, and surprise is often expressed that ready-money betting should be discouraged while betting on credit is permitted. The explanation however of this apparent anomaly is that ready-money betting—i.e. betting where the backer deposits his stake before the race is run—is the only kind of betting which can be indulged in by those whose circumstances prevent their receiving credit. Moreover the layers of odds whose trade is restricted to this kind of betting are for the most part men who have no capital and still less credit, and with whom backers will only bet on condition of their settling immediately after the race, a condition not always fulfilled. It is therefore an undeniable fact that ready-money betting encourages and fosters the most objectionable class of backers and layers, and lies at the root of all the widespread evils which we now have to deplore. If the reader will look at the army of betting-men plying their ready-money trade inside and outside the enclosures at any race meeting, clad in coats of many colours, openly displaying the paraphernalia of their calling, and defying the regulations under which they are permitted to pollute the racecourses with their presence, he will be able to estimate the enormous importance of the change which would be effected if the authorities would energetically endeavour to put down so crying an evil. A notice from the Stewards of the Jockey Club to the clerks of courses and managers of meetings to the effect that they will be expected to enforce the regulations which they are already in the habit of publishing, would probably have the desired effect. At all events it is high time that the Jockey Club took some action in the matter.

With regard to the morality of the turf, it is difficult to determine whether it is worse now than it has been hitherto. We see it stated in the press and elsewhere that corrupt practices in connection with racing are increasing to such an alarming extent as to threaten the very existence of the sport and to call for very energetic action on the part of the authorities. It is publicly asserted that a ring of owners and jockeys has been formed, who "arrange" races beforehand and play into each others' hands, so that it is no longer possible for an owner or a jockey to succeed without, to use a vulgar expression, "*standing in with the gang*."

These rumours are of course well known to the authorities, but it

is difficult to obtain positive proof of a state of things which can easily be dealt with if clear evidence could be obtained to incriminate the chief participators in these misdoings. I am inclined to think that although there is no smoke without fire, there is a considerable amount of exaggeration in the vague statements which are now so freely circulated and so rarely substantiated. It is impossible to ignore the fact that a vast amount of dishonesty, fraud, and rascality is associated with the sport of racing, and it is the responsible duty of the Stewards to face the consequent dangers and difficulties with courage and determination. No one can deny that the tendency of the legislation by the Jockey Club during the past decade has been in the right direction; but much yet remains to be done, and the authorities in their efforts to purify and improve are unfortunately confronted at every turn by the most determined and unscrupulous opposition which the ingenuity of man can devise.

The labours of Hercules and of Sisyphus were not more disheartening than are the duties of Stewards of the Jockey Club when conscientiously performed in these enlightened days. As long as they abstain from what is called harassing legislation, they are rated in the public press and elsewhere for their apathy and incompetence: as soon as they take action at what they deem to be a fitting opportunity for the punishment of some offender or for the reform of some abuse, they are assailed by a chorus of dissent and hostile criticism. They live in a perpetual cross-fire between those who cry out for reform and those who will have none of it.

“ — those behind cry ‘Forward!’  
And those before cry ‘Back!’ ”

As long however as they disregard this kind of clamour, and show a determination to grapple fearlessly with all difficulties as they arise, above all while they make it clear that they will firmly enforce obedience to the rules and regulations which they administer under the authority of the Jockey Club, they will not only receive the hearty support of all those whose approval is worth securing, but they will succeed in the task which some consider hopeless, of purifying and rescuing the most truly national of our sports from the discredit and degradation with which it is threatened.

CADOGAN.

## PERSIA IN EXTREMIS.

Few people perhaps realise how short a time has elapsed since Indian statesmen were accustomed to keep a jealous outlook upon Persia as the quarter whence from outside there was the greatest likelihood of danger to our Eastern Empire. Less than thirty years ago the advance of a Persian army to Herat was sufficient to revive alarming memories of Nadir Shah's victorious invasion of Hindostan, and to induce even so cautious a statesman as Lord Canning to acquiesce in the despatch of one of the most useless expeditions recorded in the annals of our history. The same sovereign still sits on the throne of Persia; the internal condition of his kingdom remains substantially the same as in 1856; its resources have not materially diminished; yet it would be difficult to imagine any combination of circumstances under which the same apprehensions that drove us into war less than a quarter of a century ago would not nowadays be laughed to scorn. The puny finger of the king of kings has long since been overshadowed by the great Northern Power whose rapid strides have already reached across the vast steppes of Central Asia well-nigh to the foot of the Hindoo Kush. That is the direction in which every finger points to-day as to the coming danger, danger such as only the perversely blind can refuse to recognise, though opinions may be divided as to its magnitude and imminence. Those who believe that a mighty stream can be forced back upon its course by diplomatic incantations, still cling to the idea that the peril may be averted by fresh political combinations before it becomes necessary to repel it *vi et armis*. It is only natural that, under these new conditions of the great Asiatic problem, no factor should be neglected which might influence its solution, and that some should be inclined to look once more towards Persia, no longer in the former spirit of jealous apprehension, but with the hope of enlisting in our favour a possible and perhaps valuable ally. The bond of a common interest, which can alone make alliances permanent, would not in this case be far to seek; for the growth of Russian power in Central Asia is pregnant with far more immediate danger to Persia than to India, and if the value attaching to the friendship of Persia to-day could be measured by the apprehensions which her hostility aroused eight-and-twenty years ago, it might be reasonably assumed that such an alliance would not be unprofitable in the present conjuncture. One must sincerely hope, and, from such indications of their policy as the Government have designed to vouchsafe, there are grounds for believing, that our rulers are too well informed to indulge in any such delusions, however specious; but the tone of a portion of the

Anglo-Indian press during the early months of the year showed so eager a disposition in certain quarters to encourage these delusions, and there is so strong a tendency in the present day to grasp at shadows instead of realities, to trust to half-measures which are no measures, and to stop up the gaps and rents in the fabric of the Empire with bogus treaties and paper conventions which the first gush of angry winds tears and scatters into shreds, that it may not be altogether flogging a dead horse to point out the folly of entering or relying upon any understanding with Persia in regard to Central Asian affairs. To borrow a French expression, applicable with far greater truth to this case than to that for which it was originally coined, Persia is to all intents and purposes, as far as the defence of our Imperial interests is concerned, *une quantité négligeable* in Asiatic politics.

If it be true that every nation possesses the form of government which it deserves to possess, the status of Persia amongst the nations of the earth cannot be more aptly nor concisely defined than in the words of a distinguished diplomatist who resided some years ago at Teheran as representative of a great European power: "*C'est le dernier des pays et le dernier des peuples.*" Government, in the real sense of the word, cannot be said to exist at all in Persia, for government means the exercise, according to certain fixed laws and principles, of certain powers vested in a central authority for the good of the commonwealth. Even in autocratic despotisms, the assertion of inherent rights is accompanied by the acknowledgment of specific duties. In no such sense is there a Government in Persia. There is only a class of rulers who are bound by no laws, who recognise no duties. They do not form an aristocracy in the land, for their power is based neither upon hereditary privilege nor upon territorial influence. They might perhaps be more correctly termed a kind of loose bureaucracy sprung up and constantly renewing itself out of intrigue and speculation. At the head, as it were, of this ruling class stands the Shah, the king of kings, the centre of the world, &c. Besides these high-flown empty titles, he possesses, I believe, another more rarely used, but which characterises far more accurately his true position, *viz.* Proprietor of the Kingdom. Everything in Persia, from the lowest peasant's hovel to the palace of the most powerful minister in Teheran, is the Shah's absolute property, of which he is graciously pleased to allow his subjects the usufruct for such time as he deems good, but which he can at any moment resume by a single word. Nor is this a mere abstract theory, a kind of legal fiction, such as in other countries often underlies, without interfering with, a totally different practice. Now it is a piece of land reclaimed for cultivation by a neighbouring village at the cost of onerous works of irrigation which attracts the notice of the Shah during his annual peregrinations; the royal fiat goes forth: "*Mal-i-*

*men ast*: this is my property." It reverts then and there to the Proprietor of the Kingdom, until royal greed and ignorance and neglect have borne their fruits, the works of irrigation fall into disrepair, and the fertile land becomes once more a howling wilderness. Now again it is a palatial mansion in the suburbs of Teheran, erected by some favourite minister out of the proceeds of his fat sinecure which catches the sovereign's eye. "*Mal-i-men ast*: this is my property." And his excellency bows himself down to the ground, and with more truth than Oriental forms of speech are often apt to convey, replies: "O King, I am your sacrifice; my house is your house." Sometimes it takes the milder form of a royal visit to the residences of the chief dignitaries of the State, where, besides tea and waterpipes, his Majesty is pleased to accept a fair portion of the host's income served up on silver salvers.

It is this idea of the Shah's personal ownership of the kingdom and all it contains that forms the keystone of the whole system of Government. The property being too vast to be administered directly by its owner, he is compelled to hand over its administration to a bevy of middlemen, of agents and sub-agents, whose chief and well-nigh only duty, as in most cases of absentee landlordism, and especially in such a case as this, where the landlord's ignorance is only equalled by his greed, consists in swelling the rent-roll to its utmost capacity. Every branch of the administration is looked upon, not as a public service to be discharged with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of expenditure for the good of the community, but solely as a means of enriching the Shah's treasury by reversing the two above-named factors. Take, for instance, the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs, which is by no means the worst, and which happens at the present moment to be held by one of the ablest and most esteemed of Persian officials. The portfolio is sold every year to the functionary who can afford to bid the highest sum for it. For that sum he is held personally responsible, but so long as he discharges that paramount pecuniary obligation, no one inquires how the work of the department is done, or more often, left undone. As for the natural results of such a system, the following may be allowed to speak for itself. I had occasion to send a telegram from Sultanabad to Ispahan, the second city of the kingdom, to which I was then proceeding. The distance may be some 120 miles. I reached Ispahan by a circuitous route after nine days' march, nevertheless I arrived before my telegram. There had been no block, no unusual accident on the line, but to my remonstrances the only reply I could obtain was a shrug of the shoulders, and a statement that "such things often happen."<sup>1</sup> And

(1) N.B. These remarks do not of course apply to the Indo-European and Indian Government telegraph lines through Persia, which are worked by Europeans and maintained in the highest state of efficiency.

so it is with all other public offices. They are the Shah's property, marketable commodities of which he enjoys the monopoly, and of which, like every monopolist, he is free to assess the value at his own rating, subject only to the necessity of leaving a sufficient margin of profit not to discourage competition. Thus it comes to pass that, as happened last spring at Teheran, and will doubtless happen again next spring, the edifying spectacle may be witnessed of the king of kings holding up to auction between his sons the most important office of the state, that of *Sipeh-Salar*, or War Minister and Commander-in-Chief. It would be easy to multiply instances of similar eccentric practices.

The Government of the provinces reproduces on a smaller scale the leading features of the central Government at Teheran. The two most important lieutenantcies of the kingdom, those of Tabreez and Ispahan, are held by sons of the Shah; that of Shiraz by one of his grandsons, a mere boy of fifteen. But whether the governors of the various provinces are nominated directly by the Shah or by his royal lieutenants, the system that prevails is everywhere the same. These appointments are usually conferred only for the short term of one year, dating generally from the *Nau Rous*, or commencement of the Persian official year, though of course the term is often renewed. But the renewal of the appointment, like the original appointment itself, depends mainly upon the governor's ability to outbid in hard cash all rival competitors. Other qualifications rank only second to this, second *magno tamen intervallo*. As every appointment is openly sold to the highest bidder, so the purchaser on his side is guided only in striking his bargain by the hope of recouping himself upon his subordinates and the population committed to his care for the amount in which he has himself been mulcted. During the first six months of his tenure of office he is engaged in replenishing his own dilapidated coffers, in the second six months he has to provide the wherewithal to secure the renewal of his appointment; nor must he neglect meanwhile to form a reserve fund against the day when the sun of the royal countenance shall withdraw from him. It must be acknowledged, in justice to the central authority, that when once the governor has satisfied the pecuniary claims of Teheran, he is allowed the fullest measure of liberty within his own sphere of action. So long as he avoids raising unpleasant questions in regard to foreign interests, which might disturb the Shah's relations with the legations at Teheran, so long as he remains on good terms with the clergy and the influential merchants, who alone are in a position to ventilate their grievances at court, and to support them with the only arguments that carry weight in Persia, the governor is allowed uncontrolled and undisturbed freedom of rule and misrule. He in turn sells all the appointments vested in his office, and so the purchase

and sale goes on from the top of the ladder down to the lowest rungs of the bureaucratic hierarchy, down to the village chief or *kedkhuda*, who farms the taxes of the peasant community, and grinds out of the people, the great dumb beast, the last farthing that can be expressed without absolutely driving them to starvation. The actual amount of taxation per head of the population has been estimated by competent authorities at about thirty shillings. The population of Persia has been variously computed at from five to ten millions. Taking the lowest estimate, which there is reason to believe is also nearest to the mark, the total amount of taxation levied would exceed seven millions sterling. Yet, if one may judge by what the Persian Government is pleased to call its budget, something less than three millions actually reaches the Shah's treasury. The difference, *i.e.* more than four millions, melts away during the process of transmission under the feverish clutch of the many hands through which it passes. Even this enormous sum represents, however, but a portion, the normal portion as it were, of the plunder upon which the ruling class fattens and thrives. It does not include the extraordinary contributions, the armed requisitions, the wholesale confiscations, the spoliation of the widow and the orphan, and other innumerable combinations of the great game of grab which constitutes the art of government in Persia.

"By the fruits thereof shall ye judge of the tree." And what fruits can such a tree bear save fruits of ruin and of death? Let anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear traverse Persia from end to end, and then point out, if he can, any single good result due to the initiative of her present rulers, any single enterprise undertaken by them for the benefit of the community, any single measure adopted by them to relieve distress, to arrest decay, to stimulate the languishing vitality of the country. There is a Ministry of Public Works at Teheran, but, except a few badly built and badly kept up roads in the vicinity of the capital, designed solely for the convenience of the court, except a few gas-lamps and electric lights set up around the Shah's palace for his Majesty's amusement, there are no public works. The few stone bridges and handsome caravan-serais on the chief highways, even the mosques and palaces which attract the traveller's eye at Ispahan and elsewhere, are almost without exception the neglected relics of long-forgotten prosperity, legacies from the time of Shah Abbas, whose name, after two centuries, is still a household word throughout the country. Still it must not be supposed that, from a Persian point of view, this Ministry of Public Works is without its uses. It effectually blocks every scheme put forward by foreign Governments for the development of the country, such as the English scheme for opening up the Karoon river to steam navigation and the Russian scheme for constructing

a harbour at Enzeli, while it has the happy knack of turning inside out the pockets of over-sanguine European capitalists who, like Baron Reuter, can afford to pay £50,000 for the preliminaries of a concession to regenerate Persia. There is a Ministry of Public Instruction; but, apart from the Imperial College at Teheran, which the sons of high officials attend "by special desire," and the high school at Ispahan, which has acquired some notoriety as a school of precocious immorality, education is more neglected to-day than it has ever been in the land which once so largely contributed to the wealth of Oriental literature. The Minister of Finance ekes out the scanty resources of his treasury by debasing the public currency, with the alarming result that the exchange for a pound sterling has risen from the normal rate of 25 *krans* to 32, and would already have reached 36 or 37 if it depended solely upon the intrinsic value of the coin. The magic skill which, assisted by the melting-pot and a little alloy, can convert a million of old *krans* into a million and a half of new ones, has, however, won his Excellency golden opinions at the palace. While the country teems with mineral wealth, and coal, copper, iron, and other valuable ores abound in the immediate vicinity of the capital, the Ministry of Mines exhausts itself in futile searches for gold, which it apparently expects to find in the bowels of the earth ready coined to the Shah's effigy. The Ministry of War absorbs nearly seven-eighths of the public revenue, but although the raw material is good and the physique of the troops generally fine, although English, French, and Austrian military missions have been successively invited to Persia to assist in the reorganisation of the army, it is practically worthless. With the exception of the Zill-es-Sultan, the Prince-Governor of Ispahan, who devotes a great portion of his time to drilling and looking after his troops, with a view to the scramble for the throne which is expected to ensue upon the Shah's death, every officer, from the War Minister downwards, regards his office or command merely as a source of more or less illicit profits. With an estimated peace establishment of 100,000 men, it is doubtful whether Persia can really muster 30,000 men under arms. Companies, battalions, brigades, exist only on paper, while captains, colonels, and generals live at home in ease, drawing with more or less regularity rations and allowances for these visionary legions. Expensive war-materials are occasionally ordered from Europe with a view rather to the commission which the officials can make out of the orders than to the real requirements of the country, and, after being perhaps once submitted to the Shah's inspection, are consigned to oblivion amid the chaos of the military arsenals. I do not think there is yet a Ministry of Marine at Teheran, but there are two or three admirals of the fleet, though neither on the Caspian nor, on the Persian, have they one single ship on which to hoist their pennants.



There are, however, other Ministries on the same *lucus a non lucendo* principle, such as the Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture, and (heaven save the mark!) even a Ministry of Justice! The merchants and artisans of the cities make up a kind of middle class, which, although more energetic and intelligent than the others, combines many of the worst features both of the upper and lower strata of society. Its principles may be summed up in the confession of the wealthiest member of the trading community in Shiraz, recorded in Dr. Wills's interesting work on the *Land of the Lion and the Sun*, "that a Persian merchant to live must cheat, and to thrive must steal." One of the most instructive phenomena that strike a traveller through Persia is the paucity and often complete absence of inhabited villages along the beaten tracks. Roads there are none, but as soon as a certain track becomes adopted for traffic, most of the villages lying in its immediate vicinity are at once abandoned by the peasants, who fly to the seclusion of some more distant hills or valleys to escape the depredations of peripatetic officials and of wealthy and influential travellers, who with their numerous retinues quarter themselves upon and plunder without mercy every hamlet they make their halting-place along their line of march. Such villages as remain are almost invariably the property of some exalted personage whose interest it is, and whose influence is therefore put forth, to shield them from over-exactions. Occasionally the worm will turn. During periods of famine, of sickness, of more than ordinary misery, the more daring spirits among the destitute peasantry take to the hills and form into bands of robbers, who render the roads unsafe, and plunder such small and isolated caravans as may fall into their hands. Sometimes the nomad tribes will take advantage of the weakness of a governor, or even purchase his collusion, and lay waste a whole province. An instance of this kind occurred last spring in the province of Khorumabad, when an Anglo-Indian officer travelling through the country was fain to join, between Dizful and Khorumabad, a caravan composed of almost the entire population of the district flying with all their goods and chattels, all their flocks and herds, from the raids of predatory Lurs. Repression, however, generally follows swiftly upon such outbreaks. Laws do not exist in Persia, except in the crude shape of the prescriptions of the Koran. The depositaries of the executive power are therefore not hampered by hard and fast rules in the administration of justice. Under ordinary circumstances it is sold like everything else to the highest bidder, but in great emergencies repression is inflicted with unstinted vigour. It takes the form of wholesale reprisals, and there are none to inquire how many innocent suffer with the guilty. Monuments of these barbarous severities meet one here and there throughout the length and breadth of the country—little columns of brick

closed up with plaster of Paris, each of which contains its victim buried alive in the tomb which he has often been condemned to build with his own hands. Poor maimed wretches with nose or ears cut off, or with mutilated stumps, begging at the gates of towns and villages, also furnish living examples of minor punishments. Thus, according to a fatal law, misrule breeds lawlessness, which in turn provokes the cruel reprisals of an arbitrary power.

Whether it should be included amongst the causes or the effects of the public demoralisation I know not, but one of the worst features of the hopeless degradation to which the country has sunk is the unnatural profligacy prevalent amongst all classes. It is not a subject upon which one can wish to dwell, though it obtrudes itself everywhere on the eyes and ears of the traveller. It has killed family life, it saps the foundations of the social fabric, it has eaten away like a gangrene the heart of the nation. It flourishes in the highest places, it plays an important part in the intrigues of the great, it pervades every class of the community, with the exception perhaps of the *iliats* or wandering tribes. *Ex privata turpitudine publica crescit ruina.*

Such is the Persia of to-day. To compare her merely with one of the smallest and least progressive of European States, she has, with an area nearly twenty times that of Portugal, a population scarcely superior in numbers, a revenue three times, and a foreign trade four times, smaller than that of the kingdom of Braganza. It would be an insult to the latter to seek to establish a comparison between the modes and methods of government which obtain in the two countries. In this respect Persia might at best, and not perhaps greatly to her advantage, be compared to those Khanates of Central Asia whose disappearance, under the stern disciplinary rule of Russia, whatever its effect upon the political situation, must be looked upon as an unmitigated blessing to humanity at large.

It does not come within the scope of this paper to enter upon a historical survey of the circumstances which have led to the preponderancy of Russia at Teheran, but a brief review of the present situation and of some recent events which appear to have escaped the notice they deserve will suffice to show, and the sooner we recognise the fact the better, that in dealing with Persia we have to deal no longer with an independent State, but with one who, in all save the name, is a vassal of the Russian Empire. Brief telegrams have recently appeared from time to time in the English press announcing that his Highness Yahya Khan, *Mushir-ed-Dowleh*, Adviser of the State, Special Ambassador of the Shah of Persia, had arrived at St. Petersburg, had been received by the Emperor and Empress with the greatest marks of distinction, and had had repeated interviews with the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs. Nothing, however, seemed to

transpire with regard to the objects of his mission, and the bare record of his Highness's movements naturally failed to awaken much interest in this country. Yet there is little doubt that this mission was destined to have considerable influence upon the future course of events in Central Asia, and its significance was certainly not diminished by the fact of its coinciding with the appointment of an Anglo-Russian Commission for the delimitation of the northern boundary of Afghanistan. As I was at Teheran at the time of the Special Embassy's departure for Russia and during the negotiations which preceded its dispatch, the information I was in a position to gather there may help to throw some light on its real purport.

The annexation of Merv by the Russians was viewed at Teheran with the same mixed feelings of relief and of anxiety which their successes against the Akkāl Turcomans at Geok Tepe and the occupation of Askabad had on former occasions excited. The predatory habits of the Turcomans, their constant raids on to Persian territory, the inability of the Persian soldiery to cope with the warlike nomads of the steppe, had too long been a source of humiliation and discomfort to the Persian authorities for them not to have experienced some sense of exultation at the final subjection of these unruly neighbours to the stern rule of the White Czar. At the same time the Shah could not close his eyes to the fact that this fresh advance of the Muscovite power materially strengthened the grip which it already held over his kingdom. Not only is the Caspian a Russian lake, and its southern shores exposed helplessly at every point to a hostile descent; not only have the Russians established an important naval station on the island of Ashurada, almost within a stone's throw of the plain of Asterabad, by which they command the road to Shahrood and Khorassan, but the Russian province of Transcaucasus overlaps the northern land frontier of Persia to the west, while to the east it is equally threatened by the new line to Kizil-Arvat and Askabad. The last Russian conquest fairly turned the eastern flank of the Persian position. The small oasis of Old Sarakhs, upon which the Persian garrison of the mud fort of New Sarakhs is entirely dependent for its existence, fell into Russian hands, and with it the key of Khorassan had passed into Russian possession. As a matter of fact, for any one who could gauge the miserable weakness of Persia, the situation had not really grown appreciably worse, for it was already so desperate that there was not room for it to grow worse. With or without Merv, with or without Sarakhs, Russia has, and for many years past has only had, to raise her little finger, and at the advance of a single *corps d'armée* the whole of Northern Persia would pass almost without a blow under her rule. But the Shah's ignorance, flattered alike by friends and by foes, maintains him in an atmosphere of beatific optimism which the angry sound of thunder close at hand can alone disturb. The annexation by Russia

of the Tekke Turcoman territory was a severe shock to the royal nerves. The Cossack had appeared at yet another gate of the kingdom. What if his next move were to demand admittance into its very heart? For a moment the Shah appeared inclined to swallow his invincible repugnance to England and all things English, which dates from our expedition to the Gulf in 1856-57, and the substantial veto we then placed on his schemes for the recovery of Herat. It is a curious fact that next to greed of money, the chief characteristic of this sovereign, who only holds what he possesses on sufferance, is greed of territory. The dream of his life has been, to reunite Turan and Iran under his sceptre. England had prevented its realisation thirty years ago, when he attempted it against us. Might not her present anxieties induce her now to consent to the fulfilment of his wishes, if undertaken under her ægis, and, ostensibly at least, out of regard to her imperial interests? Might she not be converted to the doctrine, which had often found favourable exponents among her own statesmen, that Herat in Persian hands would be a powerful bulwark against the Russian advance towards India? The influence of the Shah's favourite son, the Zill-es-Sultan, who governs Southern Persia from Ispahan, and who was at the time on a visit to his father at Teheran, was exerted in favour of such a policy. This, perhaps the only Persian prince who has the wish, as well as the necessary ability, to endeavour to raise his country out of the slough of despond in which it has been wallowing since the accession of the Kajar family to the throne, strongly urged the necessity of some vigorous stroke to check the effects of the last Russian move. But the arrest of Eyoub Khan close to the Afghan frontier, and the appointment to the Foreign Office of a Minister supposed to be more accessible to English counsels, were the only real successes he was able to score. He quitted Teheran humiliated by his failure to secure for himself the War Office, which the Shah gave to another of his sons, devoted to the Russian interest, the Naib-es-Sultaneh, in grateful acknowledgment of a well-timed present of 250,000 tomans, which it is popularly believed at Teheran were supplied for the purpose to its *protégé* out of the coffers of the Russian Legation. The halting overtures made by the Shah to our Government with regard to a Persian occupation of Herat fell upon deaf ears; nor, considering the utter worthlessness of the ill-disciplined, ill-officered rabble which the Shah is pleased to call his army, can our Ministers be blamed for declining to lean on so rotten a reed. At the same time there came from Central Asia sundry reports of our reverses in the Soudan, which were none the less greedily swallowed because of the roundabout course they had taken, or the doubtful source whence they were evidently inspired. The Shah's hatred and distrust of England speedily revived, and a little gentle pressure, such as Russia knows so well how to bring to

bear upon her neighbours at the proper psychological moment, did the rest. A dangerous agitation, which, if not altogether spontaneous, required but little stimulus from without, arose throughout Khorassan against Persian rule. The approach of the Russians, already popular throughout the country as the liberators of thousands and tens of thousands of unfortunate Khorassanis, held in bondage by the Akkal Turcomans and the Khans of Khiṣṣ and Bokhara, was greeted with genuine enthusiasm by the border population. For years past their advent had been impatiently expected, earnestly prayed for. Colonel (now General Sir Charles) Macgregor constantly alludes to this feeling in the account of his journey to Khorassan in 1875. "They (the Khorassanis) all said that if the Kajars, the ruling dynasty in Persia, were not such contemptible characters, they would go and fight the Turcomans and release their people. But they could expect nothing from the Shah, and they eagerly asked when the Russians were coming, adding, 'May God send them speedily!'" And again: "In Khorassan there is another opinion which is as prevalent as belief in the Russians, and that is contempt of the Kajars. This I have heard expressed over and over again, coupled with epithets the reverse of complimentary. So much is this the case that I do not think the Shah need ever hope for any active support from his Khorassani subjects against Russia. And now it seemed as if Allah had almost granted their prayers. The might of Russia had delivered them from their great dread of the savage Turcoman. Why should she not free them once and for all from the hated rule of the Kajars? A petition to the great White Ozar was circulated through the towns and villages of Khorassan, praying for annexation to Russia. It is said to have received over ten thousand signatures. Even in the holy city of Meshed, under the shadow of the sacred shrine of Imaum Riza, a strong pro-Russian party grew up in spite of local fanaticism. The universal craving for release from systematised oppression and extortion outbore the Mussulman's natural repugnance to the rule of the unbeliever. It did not, however, enter into the plans of Russia to push matters to an extremity. Her purpose was attained by the note of warning which these events conveyed to the Court of Teheran. A few stern words, spoken rather in sorrow than in anger, by the Russian Minister, finally threw the Shah back into the arms of "his dear ally" Alexander III. The King of Kings, the Centre of the World, was taught once more in unmistakable accents that he existed only upon sufferance, and that he must renew his wavering allegiance at the foot of the Russian throne.

It was for this purpose that one of the highest dignitaries of the kingdom, closely connected by marriage with the person of the sovereign, the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, after having been raised for the occasion to the rank of Highness, was dispatched in July last as

Special Ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg. The nominal object of his journey was to present the Czärewitch on his coming of age with the portrait of the Shah set in costly diamonds. But that he was charged with a far more important mission could be easily inferred from his prolonged and repeated audiences and interviews, before his departure from the Persian capital, with the Shah and the Russian Minister, and the real tendency of his instructions was sufficiently indicated by the fact that they were given to him personally by the sovereign over the head of his nominal chief, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, whose English proclivities had brought him into discredit at the Palace, and who was only made acquainted with their tenor after the Special Ambassador had reached his destination and been received at Zarskoe Selo. If anything more were wanted to show the peculiar value attached by Russian diplomacy to this so-called *mission de courtoisie*, it might be enough to add that the expenses of the embassy were defrayed by the Russian Legation, who, in presence of the penury of the Persian treasury, generously advanced a sum of 20,000 tomans (£7,000) for the ambassador's personal wants. What the exact nature of the concessions demanded by the Russian Chancellerie may have been the future probably alone will disclose. But in well-informed circles at Teheran no doubt was entertained that Yahya Khan was the bearer not only of a pretty bauble, but of a secret agreement for the settlement of certain frontier questions, the solution of which would materially strengthen the position of Russia in her newly acquired possessions and facilitate her further advance. That the continuation of the Transcaspian Railway from Kizil-Arvat, its present inland terminus, onwards into Central Asia would be strenuously prosecuted by the Russians after their recent successes was only to be anticipated, and, passing through Khrasnovodsk, the chief port on the Eastern Caspian, I saw copious indications of this determination in the large stores of railway material being loaded into barges for conveyance to Mikhailovsk, the sea terminus of the line. The section of the line from Kizil-Arvat to Askabad has already been commenced, and will probably be finished in the course of the next twelve months. With regard to the further prolongation of the line beyond Askabad, opinions seem to be still divided in Russian military circles. Should it be pushed on direct across the desert to the Tejend at Dam, and thence across another stretch of bleak open steppe straight into the oasis of Merv and the valley of the Murgh-ab? Or would it not be better to leave Merv on one side, to be ultimately connected with the Grand Trunk Railway which is to be carried through Turkestan from Orenberg, and continue to run the Transcaspian line along the northern scarp of the Khorassan Mountains to the all-important point of Sarakhs and the valley of the Heri-food? The latter line was surveyed by the Russian engineer Lessar during his adventurous

journey to the gates of Herat in 1882, and there are many strong arguments in its favour. Apart even from another scheme, advocated in connection with it by the same Lessar, which by diverting the waters of the Tejend into an old channel, would fertilise the whole steppe down to the very walls of Askabad, the line recommended by Lessar would present the twofold advantage of running through a comparatively well-watered region, since it would skirt the northern base of the Kōuren and Kopet-Dagh range, and of tapping the shortest and easiest route to Herat up the valley of the Heri-rood, which, now that the myth of the stupendous mountain barrier of the Paropamisus has been dispelled, is known to offer no serious engineering or strategical difficulty. These points have been strongly urged at St. Petersburg, and it is even stated, though as yet, I believe, without any official confirmation, that Lessar's scheme has been definitely adopted in the highest quarters. To carry it out, however, it would be necessary to arrive at a distinct understanding with Persia in regard to the frontier of the two countries, of which from the neighbourhood of Askabad to Sarakhs there has never been any regular delimitation. As far back as 1873 Colonel Valentine Baker, in his *Clouds in the East*, pointed out with admirable foresight the advantage which Russia would some day reap from allowing this frontier question to remain open until she was in a position to dictate its settlement at her own discretion. Surveying the disputed borderland from the heights of Dereghez: "What a splendid country," he observes, "this would be under settled rule. But Persia seems to take no trouble in maintaining her frontier. Unless some action is taken, it appears likely soon to lapse into Russian hands, and will thus give them a perfectly level, rich, and well-watered highway from the Caspian to Herat, with forts that only want occupying along the entire line. Yet we seem ready to allow this part of Persia to pass away from her without a remonstrance." At the time these prophetic lines were penned, the Russians had scarcely begun to feel their way inland from the Caspian. Russian troops can now be conveyed from any part of the empire by steam and by rail as far as Kizil-Arvat. There is a Russian fortress at Askabad. The whole country has been surveyed and mapped out by Russian engineers. The Persian frontier has been thrust back from point to point to suit the requirements of the Russian military authorities. The time at length arrived for the Persian Government to be invited to give its formal sanction to the *faits accomplis*, and there is little doubt that before leaving for St. Petersburg the Mushir-ed-Dowleh was empowered to accept the Russian delimitation of the new frontier line from Askabad to Sarakhs. Baker's prophecy is fulfilled to the letter. The Shah is also believed to have conveyed to his imperial ally the assurance of his readiness to meet the wishes of Russia on another

and still more important point, viz. that under certain given circumstances, presumably an English advance into Afghanistan, Russia should be allowed to occupy and garrison the Persian frontier south of Sarakhs along the western banks of the Tejend and Heri-rood as far as Kiafir-Kaleh, *i.e.* as far as the point where the main road from Herat to Meshed reaches Persian territory. The value of this concession need hardly be enlarged upon. It would sufficiently explain the alacrity with which Russia has consented to the appointment of the mixed commission for the delimitation of the North Afghan boundary, since, wherever the line may be drawn, she would still be at liberty to turn it by occupying the Persian posts along the Heri-rood, and she might thus, at a given moment, without breaking faith with the British Government, appear within three or four days' march (seventy-five miles) of Herat on the road which of all others affords the easiest access to that city.

The important point for the British public is to keep in mind the general drift and ultimate aims of Russian policy in Persia, and to remember that, whatever they may be, Persia has neither the will nor the power to delay their attainment for a single day, much less to oppose to them any serious or permanent resistance. Though for a while it may be only whispered into the Shah's ear with all the precautions of diplomatic speech, instead of being proclaimed at the mouth of the cannon, the will of Russia is law supreme at Teheran. No blame can be attached to our diplomacy in respect of this consummation, for no human skill could have averted it. Persia's internal degradation, of which I have attempted to convey some idea in these pages, has cast her helpless at the feet of her powerful neighbour. Russia is near: England is far. That is the whole secret of the moral vassalage into which Persia has fallen. But blame, and serious blame, attaches to our rulers for refusing openly to recognise, or rather seeking to suppress, this fact. Condemnation still more severe would await them if they wilfully blinded themselves to it, and attempted to deal with Persia as an independent factor in the Central Asian question. Skobeleff spoke no mere idle boast when on a memorable occasion he declared: "Never has the influence of the Russian Minister at Teheran been so all-powerful as it is to-day." In one word, the spell of the Russian standard is potent far beyond the limits of the regions we have conquered." Why should we refuse to listen to the truth because it falls from the lips of a noble antagonist? Whatever the dangers that threaten our imperial interests, we have nought to seek, as we also have nought to fear, at Teheran. The defence of our Indian Empire is too momentous a task for us to entrust any share in it, however slight, to what Carlyle would have called "that miserablest phantasm" among nations—Persia. , M. VALENTINE CHIROL.



## CAROLINE BAUER.

Among the troops of the Rhenish Confederation whom Napoleon compelled to bear arms under his banners against other German-speaking nationalities, there fought and fell in 1809, at the battle of the Marchfeld before Vienna, one Heinrich Bauer, a captain of Würtemberg horse, leaving a young widow and infant family very sparsely provided with worldly goods.

Madame Bauer belonged to a respectable burger family named Stockmar, who had long been settled in Coburg Anhalt, in the capital of which dreary little principality she had passed her early life, and of which, as it existed towards the end of last century, she has left a graphic if not a very edifying picture. Coburg appears to have been just such a *Residenz* as may have suggested to Schiller the scene and the incidents of his *Kabale und Liebe*, with its despotic princes, its shabby and profligate court, arrogant and besotted nobles, and servile people: a dull and rather indecent burlesque of royalty. A generation earlier these petty sovereigns had driven a prosperous trade with George the Third of England, to whom, when the patriot king was in want of soldiers to put down the rebellious colonists in America, they had been in the habit of selling their subjects, like cattle for exportation, at the rate of fifty gulden a head. These merry days were now over, and Duke Ernest of Coburg could only supplement the deficiencies of his Civil List, which, owing to the extravagance of his predecessor, was fixed at the modest sum of £1,800 a year, by the vulgar process of borrowing upon pledges from such of his lieges as were known to have accumulated money. Madame Bauer had a vivid recollection of the terror which used to seize upon her grandfather, a worthy tradesman in the town, when he saw one of the Court officials approaching his shop with a bundle of valuables under his arm wherewith to raise funds for the supply of the ducal wants. A business-like man, with no sentimental scruples, might have made a fortune by such dealings with impecunious royalty; but the old Stockmar was a firm believer in the divine right of reigning dukes, and would not only have thought it an act of treasonable temerity to refuse the loans demanded, but considered it inconsistent with his loyalty to accept the proffered security. The result was that he died impoverished and brokenhearted.

If the Princes of Coburg did not pay their debts, however, they remained "gracious protectors" to the families of the tradesmen they condescended to ruin. Several of the Stockmars thus obtained small offices about the Court, and Madame Bauer's nephew, Christian, was

promoted from the position of an apothecary's assistant to become the medical adviser and, ultimately, the ennobled and confidential secretary of a scion of the ducal house, the Prince Leopold, well known in time to come as the husband of the Princess Charlotte of England, and as the first King of the Belgians.

The *Rittmeister's* widow had a hard struggle to maintain in educating her four children, of whom Caroline, the youngest, who had been trained for the position of governess, showed so strong a determination to go upon the stage, that in spite of all family opposition she, when only in her sixteenth year, made her *debut* at the Carlsruhe Theatre, where the sympathy of the officers of the garrison with the dead captain's pretty daughter obtained her a favourable reception, and an engagement at a salary of about £80 a year. Her professional experiences during the next twenty years form the subject of two of her works, the *Bühnenleben* and the *Wanderungen*; her private life for the same period is recorded in the *Posthumous Memoirs*, an indifferent English translation of which has recently been published. The German stage was in those days, even more than it is at present, a State institution. The sovereign was its chief and the fountain of all its rewards and honours; the manager was a functionary of rank; the very boxkeepers were public officials. The corps dramatique was drilled and disciplined like a regiment, gradations of rank being strictly defined, and promotion regulated under a system of selection by merit tempered by seniority. The public, however, was permitted to exercise a material influence over the destinies of actors and actresses, and the right of judgment thus conceded to the audience served to foster a cultivated taste and an enlightened spirit of criticism in theatrical matters.

Caroline Bauer had from the first recognised the fact that hard work and drudgery were indispensable conditions to success, and by means of much conscientious study, a handsome face, and a melodious voice, together with graceful and winning manners, she became popular. Of genius, however, she had not a spark, and the versatility which made her a useful member of the theatre was not calculated to advance her to the highest rank in any one branch of her profession. She could sing in an opera and dance in a burlesque, and appeared alternately as a page and as Juliet, as a pert chambermaid and Mary Stuart. She thus came to be a favourite actress of the second class, above which level she never rose. It was, however, something to have achieved this average at a time when the German stage was singularly rich in talent and cultivation. As she herself says, "I was never the most considerable or eminent artist of my day; but I had the good fortune to work among the greatest actors of our century, in the very springtime of dramatic art."

The volumes in which Fräulein Bauer has recorded her professional

experiences are pleasantly free from the *jalousie de métier*, prevalent in artistic life. She ungrudgingly admits the merits of her superiors, and speaks charitably and with good nature of all her colleagues. The achievements of the notabilities of the German stage in past generations possess, however, little interest for English readers. The fame of singers and dancers is universal, because independent of nationality; the reputation of actors is necessarily localised within linguistic and geographical boundaries. We can all remember Henrietta Sontag and Fanny Ellsler; but the names of the comedians and tragedians of Germany half a century ago have lost their meaning to us. Even in frugal Germany eminent members of the opera and the ballet could earn large sums; but the actors were poorly paid, and Caroline Bauer's professional income never appears to have exceeded £300 a year. She was, however, permitted to supplement her official salary by occasional foreign tours, and thus succeeded in obtaining some profitable engagements at St. Petersburg and Vienna. It was while on her way to the former capital that we meet with a striking instance of her habitual good nature and kindness. A broken-down old German actor at Riga induced her to appear at a performance announced for his benefit. On the appointed day, however, she had completely lost her voice from the effects of a severe cold, and the poor man was in despair, since his tickets had been sold entirely on the strength of the promised appearance of the Berlin actress, and if she failed him, he would be required to refund the money, the greater part of which was already expended. He had a wife and many children, would she not, in pity for them, try his remedy for hoarseness? it was a very severe one, "too terribly Russian for a delicate lady, but——" "And this remedy?" "Well, you must let a whole quart of scalding hot beer pass slowly and uninterruptedly down your throat." "Is that all?" "No; there is something more, honoured Fräulein," said Dölle timidly; "before drinking it you must hold a tallow candle—a good thick one, four to the pound—in the boiling beer, and stir it about till nothing but the wick is left!" The kind-hearted actress shuddered, but consented to swallow the nauseous draught, and by evening had completely recovered her voice.

Although living under her mother's roof, and deriving a certain social consideration from her paternal connections, Caroline Bauer was not exempted from those questionable attentions to which pretty and popular actresses are exposed on the part of unscrupulous admirers. On her first public appearance at Carlsruhe a distinguished general, Count Friederich Wilhelm von Bismarck, became enamoured of the young *debutante*, and enlisted her brother in his service for the prosecution of his suit. Caroline, be it here said, had two brothers—Louis, who had grieved his mother by adopting a mercantile career instead of seeking service at the Court of Coburg; and Karl, a high-

spirited youth, who had entered the army, and in order to maintain his position as an officer and a gentleman, incurred debts and drew largely upon the slender means of his mother and the earnings of his sister. It was he who now informed Caroline that Count Bismarck had actually joined him in his ride; had alluded in flattering terms to his dead father, and placed his purse at his disposal. "And then he spoke of you, Lina,—of your beauty and sweetness and accomplishments,—growing quite enthusiastic over you. He declared that he loved you, and that if he had not his old wife on his hands he would make you his countess, and that if you would only wait until she was gone he would marry you, and make over his whole fortune and provide for all of us, and double my lieutenant's pay. Oh, Lina, what a prospect!" "I cannot deny," says the little actress naïvely, "that all this greatly flattered my vanity, but my guardian angel saved me from becoming the mistress of a married man!"

Shortly after, Louis, the reigning Grand Duke of Baden, a man between sixty and seventy years of age, sent a Court official to her with the most brilliant proposals; but here again her guardian angel stepped in, this time in the form of a theatrical agent, with the offer of an engagement at the Berlin Court Theatre at an increased salary of £150 a year. She had no sooner appeared upon the boards in the northern capital than Prince Augustus of Prussia made love to her after the vigorous fashion of his uncle, Frederick the Great, declining to take any denial. So importunate did he at length become in urging his suit, that the fair Caroline could only escape his rough wooing by leaping out of a window into the street—a gymnastic feat which, she tells us, her theatrical training "in the part of mischievous pages and other trowser characters" enabled her to perform without injury to life or limb. Her next love adventure was of a more sentimental character—a beautiful youth with diamond eyes and pulmonary tendencies having taught her what it was "to love and to be loved." This was, as far as we are informed, the one romance in Caroline's life. It was short-lived, however, for the beautiful prima donna, Amalie Neuman, who brooked no rival near her throne, threw her spell over the diamond-eyed one, who then and there transferred his homage to her. This Amalie was the siren of whom Heine wrote:—

"See what a lovely face can do! It is fortunate that I am shortsighted, otherwise this Circe would have changed me, as she did one of my friends, into a little grey animal with long ears. . . . She has already turned several youths into lunatics. . . . One suffers from hydrophobia and writes no more verses . . . a boy at a grammar-school has fallen frantically in love, and keeps sending her his copy-books as specimens of his handwriting."

When Circe released her victim he once more threw himself at Caroline's feet; but she had by this time found solace for her broken heart in a contemplated marriage with a Russian count whose eyes

are not described, but who possessed real diamonds and fabulous wealth—a liberal-minded nobleman, who had not only agreed to settle eight thousand guldens a year in pin-money upon his future wife, but would allow her to pursue her theatrical career even after she should have become the Countess Sannailov. On the eve of their marriage, however, he was discovered to be not the Count himself, but the Count's discharged valet, who had appropriated his master's wardrobe and loose cash, and whose magnificently arranged wedding-tour was diverted into a solitary journey to the fortress of Spandau. Henceforth the little actress, who, to do her justice, had always entertained very practical ideas in matters of finance, seems to have reserved her sentiment for the stage. The tender passion, it is true, is still a frequent subject of rhapsody in her journal and letters, "for a woman's life is her heart, and the heart is love;" but we are allowed to see but little of the working of this organ, which appears to have been judiciously subordinated to prudential and worldly considerations.

While on a visit to the Court of Berlin in 1826, the Duke of Wellington had remarked upon the striking resemblance which Caroline Bauer bore to the late Princess Charlotte of Wales;—a resemblance which so painfully impressed the widowed Prince Leopold when, two years later, he saw her dancing at the Court Theatre at Potsdam, that he called upon Madame Bauer on the following morning and requested a private interview with her daughter. The situation was comical enough, though the fair Caroline, who was always sadly deficient in the sense of humour, does not appear to have been conscious of its ludicrous side. Middle-aged Serene Highness, unbecomingly dressed, sentimental and prosy, but diplomatically cautious; *Mademoiselle* playing the *Ingenue* in her prettiest and most audacious manner; and *Madame Mère* listening at the door of the adjoining room prepared for eventualities. Cross-questioned by the Prince as to her antecedents and the state of her affections, Caroline unhesitatingly exercised her imagination at the expense of her memory. No, she was a complete stranger to love (had she forgotten the diamond-eyed one?); and, although she had had numerous brilliant offers of marriage (these events are not recorded in the Memoirs), she had refused them all because she did not love, for "Lina does not sell herself even to a husband."

Leopold did not commit himself to any distinct declaration as to the nature of his intentions: Christian Stockmar, he said, would make all necessary arrangements; and under any circumstances their union would be "a pleasant one founded upon a moral basis." With this satisfactory assurance he departed, after enjoining strict secrecy, leaving mother and daughter overcome by joyous emotions. "And do you believe that you love the Prince, Lina?"—

‘I don’t know, mother,’ I cried, weeping and laughing in a breath; ‘he is much older than I am, and there is nothing of the ardent lover about him. Were he to appear on the stage in such a character he would certainly be hissed. And then did you notice his wig?’ ”

Prince Leopold had no reason to complain of want of zeal on the part of his secretary, Stockmar, who having invited his aunt and cousin to Coburg explained to them the nature of the proposed alliance, “stripping it of its romance and reducing it to a dry matter of business.” His master, he said, was weary of his foolish *liaisons*, which were, moreover, injurious to his health, and he longed for a life of calm domesticity. His intentions were perfectly honourable, otherwise he would have chosen another negotiator, “for the Prince knows that I am not to be trifled with where the point of honour is concerned, and that Lina’s mother was born a Stockmar!” Baron Stockmar’s ideas of the point of honour were peculiar. He proceeded to inform his cousin that “a sort of private morganatic marriage” would take place, under which she would receive an annuity and the titles of countess; but no one would be allowed to know of this, for if the fact transpired it might endanger the Prince’s English pension of £50,000 a year. “Thus, pray, bear in mind, that only before God and your nearest relations will you be the Prince’s wife; in the eyes of the world, if it should come upon your track, it would not appear quite so pure or lawful.” In the event of there being children, which was not to be desired, they would be decently provided for, and if the union should sooner or later be dissolved she would have a retiring pension. She must not, however, expect to reap a golden harvest, for the Prince was very economical; nor must she be unprepared for infidelities on his part, for “the hearts of these highborn gentlemen are cut out of very peculiar wood. And what if the little flame were to be extinguished even after the bridal night!” Caroline Bauer describes her cousin Stockmar as being throughout these negotiations every inch the *chargé d’affaires*. This is severe upon the diplomatic service.

The scene next changes to a villa in the Regent’s Park, which Stockmar had hired for the reception of his aunt and cousin, and where the Prince occasionally visited his beloved. It must be allowed that he was *not* “an ardent lover,” for during these visits Caroline was required to read or to play to him for hours together, till her voice failed her and her fingers became numbed, while he employed himself in “drizzling”—an inane occupation which had been the fashion at the Court of Paris in the days preceding the Revolution, and which the French emigrés had introduced into England. They called it *Parsiflage*, which consisted in unravelling, and rewinding upon reels, the threads of gold and silver lace or tassels by means of a small pocket instrument. Weary months passed in this dismal form

of courtship. The promised "alliance" was no longer mentioned, and it was not until thoroughly weary of her solitary life, and driven to distraction by "the eternal whirl of the drizzling machine," the little actress threatened to return to the stage, that the Prince agreed to make her "his morganatic wife in legal and moral form *as far as circumstances would permit.*" Accordingly, in the summer of 1829, "a kind of marriage ceremony took place in our little house in the Regent's Park. But oh, so dismally desolate! *No clergyman* placed his hand on my head to invoke a blessing, no bridal wreath adorned my hair. . . . What wretched notions the Prince and Stockmar had of matrimony and domesticity!"

Wretched notions indeed! A "marriage" without the sanction of either the law or the Church, complete isolation, and a drizzling machine! There was, to be sure, a settlement drawn up by Cousin Christian and witnessed by high-spirited brother Charles, which secured her an annual allowance for life; and she was called Countess Montgomery. No one knew better than she did herself, however, that Prince Leopold of Coburg had as much power to create her Empress of China as Countess of Montgomery. Indeed, it must be allowed that no deception was practised upon the lady. She was aware that there was no pretence of marriage even in a morganatic sense, and that the "settlement," to which her brother and her cousin were parties, was only the instrument under which she obtained an allowance whenever she ceased to be the mistress of Prince Leopold.

Madame Bauer, too, was a strangely complacent witness to her daughter's "union," which proved an unhappy and a shortlived one. The sprightly actress, whom a congenial marriage and a cheerful home might have reconciled to the abandonment of her public career, suffered and pined under a solitary existence only occasionally broken by the dull companionship of him whom she had by this time discovered to be an "ossified egotist," and "the wreck of a man." English life—she did not know a word of the language and was not allowed to form acquaintances—was opposed to all her tastes and habits; and the appearance of her brother Karl, who threatened to commit suicide unless provided with 16,000 guldens, brought matters to a crisis. The Prince indignantly refused to supply the funds required to avert the catastrophe, or to allow any part of the settlement to be applied to Karl Bauer's relief; and Stockmar denounced mother, son, and daughter as conspirators engaged in a plot to rob his beloved master.

Then the long pent-up indignation burst forth. "I hurled into their pale faces my whole crushed and degraded heart, till my voice was choked by hysterical sobs." . . . "You are the accomplice of the Prince," Caroline told her cousin, "since you thought only of him and his pleasure, and believed you had done all for your poor deluded

relative when you enacted a sham marriage ceremony for her reputation's sake, and arranged a certain provision for her future maintenance. I charge you, Christian Stockmar, with having made me the plaything of a princely whim." Here, again, the comical element mars the heroic effect of the scene, for nothing can be funnier than to find Stockmar attempting to stem the torrent of invective pouring from his cousin's lips, by the assurance that if he was not unfortunately already provided with a wife he would gladly have compensated her for the injury he had done through his extreme good nature by marrying her himself! "And so I parted from Prince Leopold of Coburg, to whom I had given myself up, body and soul, with the confidence of a loving heart only a year before; and from my cousin Christian Stockmar, whom I had loved and honoured as an elder brother. . . . I have never seen either of them since." The "union" was dissolved with as little formality as it had been contracted. Prince Leopold ascended the throne of Belgium, Secretary Stockmar became the honoured mentor of the future Prince Consort of England, and Caroline Bauer returned to the stage, which she only abandoned in 1842 to retire into a happy married life.

When on his acceptance of the Belgian crown Leopold of Coburg resigned the allowance of £50,000 a year which had been granted to him by Parliament on his marriage with the Princess Charlotte, the announcement by the Government of the surrender of this allowance was greeted by vociferous cheers and eulogistic speeches in both Houses, and the public out of doors echoed these expressions of grateful appreciation of a magnanimous act. There were two circumstances, however, which considerably detracted from the merit of the sacrifice and the value of the gift. The surrender of his English pension had been made an indispensable condition of Prince Leopold's elevation to the throne of the new kingdom; and under the terms of this surrender the Prince had stipulated for the allowance remaining liable for a number of very considerable charges, including "the payment of suitable rewards to those persons who have claims upon me for their faithful services during my sojourn in this country." Among the "faithful services" thus requited at the cost of the English taxpayer were those rendered by Christian Stockmar and his cousin Caroline Bauer, both of whom (shade of Joseph Hume!) for their remaining days drew from her Majesty's Treasury the pensions settled upon them by the widowed consort of the Princess Charlotte of Wales.

E. B. DE FONBLANQUE.



## *HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.*

It is unnecessary, in this retrospect of the month, to dwell at any length upon its chief incidents—the passage of the Reform Bill and the second reading of the Redistribution Bill. The latter measure is copiously discussed, from different points of view, elsewhere. Nothing more remains to be done here than to offer a few remarks upon two or three matters more or less closely connected with it. The Conservatives put the best face they can upon a Bill which the majority of them dislike and distrust. Lord Randolph Churchill is taking a holiday in India. To him, as to several other members of his party, the measure is profoundly unsatisfactory. Yet, whatever cabals or intrigues may be formed against it, its speedy addition to the statute-book is certain. The sentiment of disgust experienced by many Conservatives at the prospect is intelligible. Lord Salisbury, after having rallied his followers to the cry of no surrender, has conceded more than the Government were in the first instance willing to propose, and more than the most sanguine Radicals dared to hope. The consciousness that this is so, cannot fail to exercise a disheartening and disintegrating influence in the ranks of Conservatism. Once more the fact has been proclaimed that the sole condition on which Conservatism as a political faith can exist is, that it capitulates at the right moment and makes itself the instrument of the will of its enemies. There will always be a Conservative party in the State; will there again be, in the old sense, a Conservative policy?

There is another circumstance in connection with the Redistribution Bill worth noticing. The better the provisions of the measure are understood, the more emphatic and general is the support which the single-member constituencies receive. Yet it is unquestionable that many sincere Liberals have been prejudiced against this arrangement by reason of its presumed parentage. It is, we have been told, the device of Lord Salisbury, and it is adopted in the interests of the Conservative party and with a sinister intent. Lord Salisbury is no more the author of this particular portion of the scheme than he was the author of the Household Franchise Bill of 1867. The idea that boroughs and counties should be divided into wards and districts, each returning a single member, was advocated by Cobden thirty years ago. “I have observed,” he said, in a speech delivered in 1858, “that where you have one member there is a tendency to maintain a higher degree of public spirit, there is a more decided demarcation in parties, and men are more earnest in their political views. . . . I have a strong opinion that where you have to give a considerable number of new members to your large towns, as, for instance, Manchester, Liverpool, and the like, it would be the most convenient and fairest plan if you

apportioned your large towns into wards, and gave one representative to each ward." The *timeo Danaos* argument, as it may be called, brought against the transaction which has resulted in the Redistribution Bill, may be met in another way. It is rather more than three years ago that Mr. Schnadhorst delivered an address at a conference of the National Liberal Federation held at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in which he anticipated the principal features of the measure which Lord Salisbury is now credited with so large a share in contriving. "It will," he then said, "be undesirable, at all events to any great extent, by conferring special representation on new and growing towns to take out of the midst of the newly enfranchised rural population their natural centres of political life and energy. To do this is to perpetuate the idea that the interests of town and country are mutually antagonistic, an idea injurious in many ways, and one which it should be the aim of every good citizen to obliterate." Mr. Schnadhorst then proceeds to sketch a Redistribution Bill after his own heart. It involved the extinction of some of the small boroughs, the surrender by Wiltshire, Dorset, Sussex, Cornwall, and other counties, "of some of their excess of representation to meet the just demands of Lancashire, Yorkshire, Middlesex, and Surrey;" the merging of small towns for electoral purposes in the county; the abolition of the existing county divisions, and their replacement by districts called, where practicable, by the names of the small boroughs, each returning a single member. The lecturer regarded the proposal of grouping boroughs with as little favour as it has found in the eyes of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone. "Instead," he said, "of binding together places probably having no common interest, these towns would, by the plan I suggest, become the centres of districts with which they would have a natural affinity growing out of their business and other relations." It is therefore scarcely too much to say that the Bill which Lord Salisbury has induced his followers to accept is less the Bill of Lord Salisbury than of the National Liberal Federation.

One need not be surprised if the single-member system on its first announcement aroused some prejudice. It is now plain that it is already popular, or on the high road to become so. Nor as a fact is there any alternative save a system of *scrutin de liste*, with all the confusions and complications which this would entail. Imagine the perplexity and inconvenience inflicted upon the electors of a borough returning, like Liverpool, nine members, if the names of twenty-one candidates, nine Conservative, nine Radical and three independent—certainly not an unduly large allowance—were written in alphabetical order on the ballot-paper and were submitted to the voter. As for dual representation, that is really an obsolete and by no means ennobling institution. When boroughs first returned members, two were allotted to all, with the exception of the City of London, which had four. The reason was that in those days the

difficulties of locomotion were such that there was always a chance of one member being detained at home, in which case the constituency would, if the disqualified representative had not possessed a colleague, have been practically disfranchised. "Dual representation," said the author of the Newcastle address to which reference has already been made, "is a fruitful source of tricks and shifts injurious to the strength and purity of political life. We are all familiar with the elector who tries to keep in with both sides by voting one and one, with the shopkeeper who hopes to secure custom by voting blue and yellow." There is another reason why the country is, upon reflection, satisfied with the cardinal provisions of the Redistribution Bill. Mr. Courtney has resigned his place in the Government because he does not consider that the measure contains adequate safeguards for the representation of minorities. He has now had abundant opportunity of explaining his views to the public, and of testing opinion upon the matter. Notwithstanding the ability with which they have pleaded their cause, Sir John Lubbock's and Mr. Courtney's speeches cannot be pronounced successes. They have in fact fallen flat, and the movement in favour of proportional representation has already collapsed. In Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Bradford, and some of the chief metropolitan boroughs, cordial resolutions have been passed by the Liberal associations in defence of the Government plan, and in condemnation of that proposed by reformers such as Mr. Courtney. The friends of proportional representation appear to think that they have nothing to do but to explain the working of a system which will enable a returning officer to make a declaration of the poll. Accordingly they describe the method in which the paper is to be marked by the elector, and the manner in which these documents are to be treated subsequently by the returning officer. Their elucidations have not hitherto been quite satisfactory. But had Mr. Courtney succeeded in overcoming this preliminary difficulty, there would have remained a graver obstacle to surmount. Granted that the returning officer can deal accurately with the papers placed in his hands, what proof have we that the result declared will faithfully represent the intentions of the electors? The experiments that have been made so far demonstrate nothing. They have been almost childish in their conception, and singularly infelicitous in their execution. For instance, at Manchester Mr. Courtney found it necessary, by way of illustrating the hypothetical practicability of his scheme, to request that half of his audience should consider themselves Conservatives, and the other half Liberals. When this convenient but arbitrary and artificial bisection has been made he has submitted to them an equally artificial and arbitrary list of candidates. He begins, that is to say, with destroying all independence in his electors, and making them mere machines, before he attempts to obtain their decision. It is ridiculous to suppose that under these cunningly fabricated conditions men can vote as freely

as they would do in a real election, with the candidates of their own choice soliciting their suffrages. Suppose that at an actual contest for Manchester there was a competition between twenty candidates raising every conceivable side issue. The electors, of course, would be guided by all kinds of considerations. The result under the present system, and under any future system, which vests a preponderance of power in the hands of a majority, roughly, perhaps, but substantially, represents the decision of the whole constituency on the main question submitted to it. Under the proportional system it may be doubted whether the most skilled mathematician could calculate all the chances or demonstrate the certainty of a definite result. In such a contest, so organised, side issues would claim far more than their due share of importance. They would, in all probability, overlie and obscure the momentous issues on which the fate of the Government and the policy of the nation depended. As matters are, the elector is a Liberal or Conservative first, and a nonconformist, or teetotaller, or anti-vaccinationist second; but the stimulus afforded by the proportional vote would be a direct inducement to him to compass the success of his crotchet at the expense of his whole political faith and profession.

The situation upon which, in the department of foreign affairs, the curtain falls at the close of 1884 is anxious and perplexed. Seldom have we been reminded in so many quarters of the burden and solitudes of empire. In North Africa, in West Africa, in South Africa, in New Guinea, in the Fiji Islands, in the Pacific as on the seaboard of the Atlantic and the littoral of the Mediterranean, in Asia as well as in Africa, in our Indian Empire as well as in our Australasian dependencies, the future is dark and uncertain. Our external relations centre round Egypt. If there were no Egyptian problem we should have no international troubles. A proposal of the English Government for arranging the finances of the kingdom of the Khedive is now before the European powers. Practically it is before one Power only. That is to say, if France accepts it, it is certain that the rest of Europe will accept it also. If France refuses, it is equally certain that the refusal will be endorsed by Germany, Austria, and Russia. The attitude of Prince Bismarck is now exactly what it was at the period of the London Conference. He says, in effect, to England and to France, that they are the two States immediately interested in Egypt and that it is for them to come to an understanding. If such an understanding is not arrived at, what alternative is there for the present Government but Egyptian bankruptcy? And this, we shall be told, the rest of Europe would never allow.

For ourselves we decline to believe that there is as yet any reason to despair of an amicable solution of the differences that exist between England and France, but we certainly do not ignore the magnitude of the obstacles in the way. The failure of the mediation

with China, placed at the disposal of France, by the English Government is unfortunate. It may be that Lord Granville will have yet another opportunity of tendering his services. But nothing has yet come of them. France is irritated against China rather than oppressed with any sense of the cost which a struggle with her may involve. She is also flushed by the unquestioned success which has attended her arms in Madagascar; she believes that she sees a chance of installing herself in Egypt, and she is actively prosecuting her designs in Tripoli. M. Ferry is doubtless sincerely anxious to compose matters with us upon reasonable terms, but M. Ferry's compatriots were never in a more exacting humour, and French honour has seldom been in a more sensitive mood. Prince Bismarck is not likely to pave the way for us or to facilitate in any manner the settlement of the pending difficulty. In the first place he is much absorbed by the domestic condition of Germany. The defeats that he has received in the Reichstag are exasperating rather than important. The commercial and industrial distress and depression, however, which are probably worse at the present moment in Germany than in any other country in the world, present politically a dangerous aspect, and the Chancellor cannot afford to abstain from precautionary measures. Then, independently of the Congo, the whole colonial policy of the Empire weighs upon him. With Egypt, therefore, he wishes to have as little to do as may be, and his inaction or non-intervention there may well operate in a manner disadvantageous to England. The state of things is one in which the good will of the German Chancellor would have stood us in invaluable stead. But it may be said we could not have secured this good will except at the price of alienating France. The retort is obvious. In the first place we have not, as matters are, succeeded in conciliating France; in the second place, is it not clear that France would have been infinitely more disposed to assist England if she were strong in the friendship of Germany than if she were, as is the case, without that friendship? But for the friendship of Italy, which remains our firm and loyal ally, we should be completely isolated.

Yet there are no vexations in our position as a European power which a wise and well-judging statesmanship cannot overcome. Except in Egypt we are not brought into active rivalry with any of our Continental neighbours. There are no exceptionally alarming questions necessarily arising out of the negotiations in which England is now engaged. The convention entered into by President Arthur with Nicaragua for the construction of a canal connecting the two oceans may be the subject of the interchange of diplomatic opinions between Washington and London. On this side of the Atlantic we have to reckon with Germany, but the obstacles in the way of arriving at an arrangement with Germany which will dispose of much or everything that now seems most ominous of trouble are gratuitously aggravated. The two nations are not, and need not

be, brought into mutual collision in the working out of their respective destinies. The superfluous population and energies of the Fatherland must overflow either into other portions of Europe or into other parts of the world. It is not strange that the Germans, with the extraordinarily minute and accurate geographical knowledge which forms a part of their national training, should yield to the colonising impulse. There is enough soil unoccupied on the surface of the globe and to spare for Germany and England, and we, of all countries, are the very last to be scandalised or alarmed by the annexations which Germany has just made in New Guinea. As regards the West Coast of Africa, unless the White Book gives so partial an account of the circumstances as to be positively misleading, no one can doubt that the display of an ordinary amount of promptitude, punctuality, and decision, would have obviated a regrettable misunderstanding. It is this kind of misunderstanding, coupled with irresolution, which is the first cause of our international difficulties. We shrink from adopting a definite course. We temporise where delay invites disaster, with the result that our conduct, while it is unintelligible to foreign statesmen, entails upon us consequences as bad as any that could wait upon rashness. It is not the so-called principles of Conservative or of Liberal policy that are answerable for the plight in which we find ourselves. It is the failure to observe any principles whatever, and the absence of any plan. While Lord Wolseley is advancing steadily towards Khartoum the pendulum of our policy is swinging to and fro. It is impossible for the present Cabinet to annex Egypt. The country will certainly not allow it to assume fresh responsibilities, if England is not to have a free hand, on the banks of the Nile. We can guarantee no debts unless we first guarantee our own position, or exact a security that the predominance which England has acquired in Egypt shall not give place to the ascendancy of any other Power. If the demand of Germany and Russia to be represented on the Caisse is serious, the hand of our Government may be forced sooner than most of us expect. Prince Bismarck having taken a definite step forward is not likely to recede. Originally he may have been only interested in Egypt because of the opportunity he recognised of embroiling England and France. But if, for whatever reasons, he has resolved that now the Egyptian question shall be settled, it is improbable that the present condition of affairs will be indefinitely prolonged. There is the best reason to believe that the Chancellor is now willing to acquiesce in any fair and reasonable proposal which England may make for the future administration of Egypt. If this is the case, it is improbable that France will meet the financial suggestions of the English Cabinet with a demand for specific explanations as to our general intentions in Egypt similar to those which she requested last summer. So long as the general question of the government of Egypt is not raised, and the discussion

is confined within the limits of finance, we shall have good reason to congratulate ourselves; and provided only that the action of the English Government is not dilatory but definite, such a limitation ought to be perfectly practicable.

If we look to the domestic condition of France we shall find that, notwithstanding the circumstance that the dispute with China is still unsettled, and the hands of the Government are inconveniently full, M. Ferry has, on the whole, succeeded in strengthening his position. However willing Prince Bismarck may profess himself to accommodate his action in Egypt to the wishes of France, and with whatever indifference he may affect to regard the Egyptian controversy as between France and England, he is a more interested observer of the relations which events are developing between the French Republic and the Celestial Empire. Germany has large commercial interests in Chinese waters, and as these could not fail to be affected by the outbreak of war, the Chancellor might find it necessary at any moment to adopt an attitude towards France very different from that which he deems expedient and practicable in Egypt. Independently of the satisfaction felt with the French Premier by the French people for having secured the support by Germany of the French pretensions in Egypt, M. Ferry has unquestionably fortified himself by the changes he has effected in the Senate. The French Reform Bill resembles the English Redistribution Bill in allotting a larger number of senators to the more populous departments. Its other provisions abolish life senatorships, and make the Electoral College consist, not of one delegate from each commune, but of a number varying from one in the case of the smallest communes to twenty-five in the case of the largest. In passing this measure M. Ferry has not only inflicted a defeat upon M. Floquet, but has increased his hold over the Senate itself, and has, so far as can be judged, secured that in the future the Second Chamber shall be largely composed of men who belong to his own political school and shall be in fairly close sympathy with the deputies.

It was hardly to be expected that the Congo Conference should have been unattended by something more than the suspicion of international rivalries. It was a comparatively easy thing for a number of representatives from the European States to assent to the principles of Free Trade on the Congo and over its basin, during a provisional term of twenty years, as well as to acknowledge the independent rights of the African Association; but friction and diversity of views were inevitable when the question of sovereignty was raised. The American representative, Mr. Casson, was not content with the German proposal that the Congo should be declared neutral in time of war. He went further, and asked that the whole of the territories declared to be free should be neutralised. This suggestion, the French representative declined on the ground that the millennium was

the more does there recede from her view that remote South African land in which the British element is retiring in hopeless contest with men of German blood." England certainly seems as if she were retiring virtually from South Africa. She is neglecting to secure the essential commercial and strategic points. To hold Capetown and leave Zululand and Delagoa Bay open to the intruder is like securing the front door of a house but leaving the back door open. In the Cape Colony itself signs are not wanting that there is a split between those who adhere to the principles of the "Afrikander Bond," and those who have raised the cry of the British Empire and have rallied under the organisation of an "Empire League." The adherents of the Bond, being principally Dutch, desire an independent national existence apart from British authority, and have, since Majuba Hill, acquired a good organisation. The advocates of the "Empire League" wish for the maintenance of Imperial rule and the integrity of the British Empire. So, whilst one meeting of excited politicians burn the Prime Minister and his companion, Mr. Sprigg, in effigy, another, identifying themselves with the "Afrikander Bond," are passing resolutions approving of the Minister's action. It would be a matter of regret if in any way the expedition of Sir Charles Warren should be interpreted as a provocation of a race contest. It is simply an effort on the side of law and order, made late in the day, and after most vexatious, irritating, and perfectly unaccountable shiftings of policy on the part of Imperial statesmen. Still it is being made, and should be sympathised with by colonists of every nationality. Sir Charles Warren hopes to be in Bechuanaland with 1,000 horsemen by the beginning of January, and about the absolute necessity of vigour there can be no reasonable doubt. After Sir Charles Warren's expedition there may be room for a South African policy, if the field is in any degree favourable. Granted that the chiefs are replaced peaceably, and the Convention line maintained without any great race exasperations, would it not be expedient for England to fulfil her manifest obligations in Zululand? If she does not occupy this territory Germany may step in, and Prince Bismarck has been, in all probability, no disinterested spectator of the way Lord Derby has been forging his own chains. The more emphatically Lord Derby disclaims responsibility beyond the Reserve the better for Germany. If it is true that during the Zulu war Englishmen were compelled to use German maps of the country, and learn geography from the Germans, so at some no distant date, if England neglects an obvious duty, she may have to learn from Germany some lessons on the proper method of governing and civilising the Zulus. Zululand has been left to itself too long, both from a humanitarian, commercial, and strategic point of view.



Bartle Frere maintained that the coast-line of the western shores of South Africa from Walvisch Bay to the Cape, thence round to Natal as far as the northern limit of the Zululand littoral, should belong to the British South African Empire. Could Delagoa Bay have been added, the most absolute security was provided for this empire, and it was not unlikely that this bay would sooner or later fall under British influence. A review of the geographical conditions of the southern part of the great continent will show that, in that case, the line of British expansion from Kimberley northwards could never be intercepted from east or west. The integrity of this base has been assailed by the intervention of Germany on the west coast at Angra Pequena. The Germans, therefore, have annexed, as is well known, the west coast from Cape Frio to the Orange River, extending their authority for twenty miles inland. Mr. Upington, the present Cape Premier, in fear that the line of German enterprise may be advanced from Namaqualand and Damaraland, and so cut off the trade route to the interior, has advocated the annexation and protectorate of a portion of the Kalihari desert adjacent to the trade route on the west. The expediency of Mr. Upington's scheme seems to be recognised to some extent by the Imperial Government. On the east our South African Empire is threatened with a great danger if Zululand is left to Germany to annex. Reports of annexation north of Port Natal are at present rife. Lord Derby has emphatically declared again and again that he would not annex Zululand beyond the Reserve territory, which is simply an inland slip of country to the east of the Tugela. Not the slightest protest, therefore, could in justice be raised against the occupation of Zululand by any other Power, the argument of proximity having been so effectually disposed of by Prince Bismarck on the west coast in the case of Angra Pequena. There was a rumour a little while since that the Transvaalers had offered to place themselves under German protection. This offer may be the corollary of the visit of the Transvaal delegates to Berlin last summer. Such a protection could hardly be allowed by the terms of the Convention of 1884, but unfortunately this Convention has already been treated like waste paper. Were German influence allowed to creep up to the Transvaal the marts of Capetown might be left desolate, the chief city of South Africa become Pretoria, and the course of commercial enterprise in that part of the interior of South Africa rest with the rulers of the Transvaal. The universal resources of this country, especially the gold mines around Leydenburg, might of themselves tempt an ambitious Power to step in. A glance at the map will show the enormously strong position of a rival European Power occupying the Transvaal and overshadowing the colonies to the south. The following extract from the *Cologne Gazette* indicates the sentiments of some Germans: "The more England settles herself comfortably on the Suez Canal and on the Red Sea as the great military route to India,

International Association, he remarked, "Of France I might say a great deal, but as the Association is at present negotiating with France, it might do harm to say hard things of a would-be friend." In this whole question it is Portugal which affords the opportunity for intrigue and diplomacy, and it is by means of an alliance with this weak and pretentious Power that a strong Power can achieve its ends.

The Niger has been left by the Conference exactly as it was, and thus excluded from the sphere of discussion in deference to the irrefragable arguments of the British representatives. The basin of the Niger has been covered with British settlements for more than a generation. Free trade prevails here, nor has the incubus of Portuguese rule been felt with its invariable tendency to strangle every possible commercial activity. Herr Flegel, a Hamburg merchant, is desirous of civilising the inhabitants of the Benue, a tributary of the Niger, and describes the country as fertile table-land with a healthy climate. By way of enhancing its natural advantages, he proposes to import gin, rum, guns, &c. Of course this project has elicited some protest from a certain class of Englishmen, who should recollect, to be perfectly fair in their objections, that in many parts of South Africa little restriction is placed upon what is called "square face" or gin. This new German expedition up the Benue starts in the spring under the guidance of Herr Flegel, and at the expense of a Dr. Riebeck, of Halle, who has built a portable steamer for use on the river. Certainly the spirit of colonial enterprise has thoroughly seized the German nation!

The importance of our South African Empire as a base for commercial enterprise towards the interior should not be allowed to escape our notice in the scramble for a prominent position in equatorial Africa. Sir Charles Warren has been sent out, not only to restore Montsia to his territory and uphold the Transvaal Convention of 1884, but to preserve the trade route to the interior of Africa. The system of railways already completed in Natal and the Cape Colony, and converging towards Kimberley, is a visible proof of the fact that the point of commercial expansion lies somewhere in the interior of the south continent, about the latitude of Bechuanaland. The natural road is along the high plateaux where engineering is most easily carried out. To gain this base of operations British enterprise has been directed and British capital has been expended. How expensive the first beginning of this commercial empire has been the British taxpayer has from time to time realised. But there is also the interest of the capitalist and investor to be considered. It is calculated that twenty or thirty millions of British capital have been invested in South Africa, chiefly in the form of loans for public works. It is with feelings of alarm, therefore, that the British capitalist sees the integrity of this base impaired by the approach of a rival power which is anxious to tap the interior from east and west. A real definition of a scientific boundary was promulgated when Sir

still distant. France does not think that the time for the peaceful conquest of Africa has come. She has even been suspected in some quarters of scheming for her own territorial aggrandisement. Upon the strength of M. de Brazza's exploits on the Congo she now claims both sides of Stanley Pool. If this claim were allowed, she would command such a position between the Upper and Lower Congo as would enable her conclusively to control the trade of the latter, and the domain of the Association would be cut in two. Again, it is suspected that, if this demand is put aside, France will have compensation in the shape of such territory north of the Congo as in course of time would give her the control of the sea-coast from the German frontier to Rudolphstadt. Thence her progress to the strong position of Banana Point would be simply a question of time, the only power to be conciliated being the Portuguese. The possibility of France, or any other of the signatory powers, reverting to a Protectionist policy must always be borne in mind. As if to corroborate suspicions, France and Portugal have both objected to a proposal that, in the event of a future railway between Stanley Pool and Vivi being extended to the sea, the same privileges and guarantees should be accorded to it as were enjoyed under the Association.

The International Association, which came into existence in 1877, and has been promoted chiefly by the generosity of the King of the Belgians and the unflagging industry of Mr. Stanley, has at length been acknowledged as a Free State by America, Germany, and England, with definite rights and privileges of its own. Can such a State, called into existence under almost unprecedented conditions, long preserve its independence? In course of time it would be an exceedingly tempting property for ambitious hands to grasp, were any signs visible of its dissolution. When railways have been constructed and the trade routes pushed forward its commercial value will be indefinitely enhanced. Mr. Stanley has stated that the body of the Association was invulnerable and intangible, but with the construction of railways and with the accumulation of wealth in certain centres it will surely possess many weak points. In the text of a Convention made some time ago between France and the Association—a Convention which, by the way, may still have some binding power in spite of the recent action at Berlin—the following clause appears: "*Toutefois l'Association, désirant donner une nouvelle preuve de ses sentiments amicaux pour la France, s'engage à lui donner le droit de préférence, si par des circonstances imprévues, l'Association était amené un jour à réaliser ses possessions.*" France, therefore, may after all have a reversionary interest in the Association. She may still hope that the railways and improvements of this State may pass into her hands. That Mr. Stanley is not altogether without suspicions of the action of France may be gathered from a remark dropped by him at Edinburgh, December 6th, when, after explaining the objects of the

# THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

---

No. CCXVIII. NEW SERIES.—FEBRUARY 1<sup>st</sup>, 1885.

---

## THE IDEAS OF THE NEW VOTERS:

### I.

A JUST estimate of the changes likely to be wrought by the increase of the voting powers of the democracy was given in the first article of the last number of this Review. There could be no greater mistake than to suppose that the majority of the new voters will come into the area of the constitution wholly in the character of political beginners. There has long been a constant interchange between the present borough and urban populations; large numbers of the more skilled workmen have, at some time during the last sixteen years, been entitled to a vote, and have exercised that vote. They only lost political rights through the necessity of following in the wake of factory and workshops to less crowded and lower-rented and rated neighbourhoods. Not only are these men trained political voters, but they have done considerable missionary work by creating political interest in their industrial and social circles. This influence, added to the advance of education, the spread of workmen's clubs, the ever-widening and increasing power of the daily and weekly press, the extraordinary demand during recent years for public meetings, lectures, and debates, has penetrated into every part of Great Britain. Personal intercourse with public life has been in many cases led, in others largely assisted, by the work of the Annual Trades-union Congress, by the influence of which Labour Legislation has been revolutionised, and capable workmen admitted to the administration of the Factory and Workshop Laws. The annual reports of the Congress and of the Parliamentary Committee of the Congress, together with books, pamphlets, and fly leaves, constantly circulated by the committee in every trades-union lodge and district, have extensively contributed to familiarise the minds of urban workpeople with the value and power of a political vote. Nor has the purely rural population been neglected. The work accomplished during the last ten or fifteen years by the National Union of Agricultural Labourers and by the Kent and Sussex Labourers' Union, has in a great measure opened the windows of the hitherto dark mind of the farm labourer. It must also be remembered that nearly every little village and hamlet

have their dissenting community and their place of worship. In these, the true gospel of truth and justice is fearlessly expounded, if not in chaste and eloquent language, yet in terms which carry conviction, strengthen character, and point to the importance and independence of the least amongst them.

I think it will be generally admitted that a few months back no experienced politician would have thought it possible to produce a Redistribution Bill which would so little divide parties as the measure now before the country, and to which, thus far, no serious or substantial objection has been offered. The chief contentions between the Commissioners and the various Local authorities, judging from the newspaper reports, would appear to have been, in a broad sense of the term, insignificant. While the people affected have been debating the names to be given to new constituencies, the Commissioners have been getting through the more difficult part of the fixing of boundaries. The only personal objection I have to the measure is the number of single-membered constituencies it creates. My objection to these constituencies is based upon the fear that it will lessen the chance of Labour Candidates getting into Parliament. Some of my most experienced colleagues in the labour movement are as strongly in favour of the single-membered constituencies, and for the very reasons that I urge against them. My case is that by running a middle-class man and a workman together, you have a better chance of welding into one the two sections of the party. Against this view my colleagues put the advantages of smaller and more compact areas, in many cases nearly wholly composed of wage-earning residents, the lessening of the workman-candidate's greatest difficulty—that of the purse—the increased facilities of closer acquaintance with the voters. Add to these the new Law against bribery, and the increased hours of polling, for which measures we are heartily grateful to Sir Henry James and Sir Charles Dilke, and, ask my friends, how can poor candidates fail to have opportunities they never possessed before? I have felt unable to contest any of these arguments. I shall not, therefore, be surprised if many others who do not altogether like the ward system, are ultimately won over to the plan for similar reasons.

Let me now ask, who will be the men and what will be the policy to be looked for under the new régime? New men there will be, the Radicalism of the House of Commons will be greatly strengthened, if not all-powerful, and we may safely look for a considerable increase in the return to Parliament of working men. The miners will, in all probability, send nearly half-a-dozen colleagues to their friend and fellow-worker, Mr. Burt. The mechanics, it is expected, will furnish at least an equal number. In both cases the numbers would be greater but for the natural obstacles offered, not only in the initial costs of a parliamentary contest, but also by the more permanent

difficulty of providing an income sufficient for the purpose of six or eight months' residence each year in London. This part of the obstacle to labour representation can, and, if found necessary, must, be met by payment of members. There are, however, some of the great amalgamated trades-unions rich enough to make these provisions for men whom they may desire to send to Parliament, but I do not anticipate this will be done, except in a few instances. Then as to the general character of the new House. It will, in my opinion, remain much as it is at present. Members will, in the main, belong to the well-to-do, if not the wealthy class of the community, but the important feature of the coming era will be that candidates will have to come up to the Radical platform, and, when returned, will have to act up to their professions. The days of promising and never performing, are past. Members will be more than ever in touch with their constituents. Opportunities for evasion and trimming will be fewer. It will be less easy to make a speech in one lobby and vote in the other. That terrible Parliamentary tell-tale, the division list, will be scanned with fresh closeness, the absentees will be brought to book, and the black sheep cast out; the political life will be more real, more earnest. What, then, are likely to be the leading features of the programme of this new epoch in our history. It must not be thought that I am expecting legislation by magic, or reform by electricity, but work will undoubtedly have to be done quicker, reforms will ripen faster, problems will have a way of solving themselves at a greater speed in 1894 than in 1884. It will be impossible to defeat measures providing for the safety of the life and limb of the wealth producers by caballing and intrigue, as was done in 1884 on the question of Mr. Chamberlain's Bill for the better protection of life at sea.

If it were possible to convey to the minds of the electorate the obstacles to legislation contained in the forms and procedure of the House of Commons, the methodical habits of the people would assuredly make short work of the present rules as to questioning, to unlimited speech, and midnight revelry in legislation. The obstructionist will probably retain his power till the privileged class and the nation come into contact on one of the great questions which are now within measurable distance—the questions of land reform and the disestablishment and disendowment of the State Church. Both are near at hand. Events will decide which shall have the precedence, and the probability is that the question of land tenure will be the first great subject for the newly-enfranchised electors. The present system has produced two evident and deplorable results. First, it has driven thousands of acres of land out of cultivation, and forced the labour which should be employed into the already overcrowded labour markets of our cities and manufacturing towns. Secondly, it has so used its rights of property in the more dense

populations, that thousands of families are housed worse than beasts on a moderately-well-managed farm. Further, the laws of entail and settlement will certainly be abolished, and substantial security taken against land accumulation by individuals or by corporations, except when in trust for local communities. The laws regulating the holdings of cultivating tenants will have to be based upon some well-defined principle of fixity of tenure and protection against ruinous rents. Unlimited accumulation of land by the few is bringing ruin upon untold numbers of our people, and placing in jeopardy the prosperity of the nation as a whole. The Bill will, of course, be denounced, ridiculed, and rejected; it will then become law.

The Leasehold Enfranchisement Bill, the motion for the Second Reading of which was supported by more than one hundred votes last session, is down for second reading on March 4th. Yet another Bill is in preparation and will be introduced this session, attacking another despotic and intolerable abuse which has too long been borne by the rural community at the hands of the territorial lords. The Bill will propose to give to religious bodies the power of purchase, and impose upon landlords compulsory sale, of sites for places of worship. In dealing with this grievance, it would be unjust to those who have dealt liberally with their neighbours and friends in the matter of sites not to acknowledge their high sense of justice and toleration. All credit is due to them, but it is notorious that in numerous cases the greatest objections have been raised to parting with land for this purpose. In many cases where it had been conceded, the most extortionate terms have been imposed. In other cases, bits of land in the most inconvenient places have been offered. The Methodist and the Baptist must now have the power of taking by law those rights which a proud and intolerant few have so long refused to them in equity. Well may the thoughtful ones amongst them say with him of old, "Mine enemies encompass me about. Whither shall I fly for aid in my day of trouble and sore distress?"

The Established Church might, under other circumstances, have been relied upon as a strong arm of defence. But it also is under sentence, and must busy itself in putting its house in order. The vast endowments now exclusively owned by a section of the community must be made available for national purposes. The untold wealth of educational endowments must be overhauled, and the course of its misdirection investigated and rectified. There are two other institutions which for centuries have existed as green pastures by still waters for the benefit of the families of the ruling classes, viz., the Army and the Navy. The new democracy will be liberal enough towards all that is necessary for both Services and for the national requirements, but the expensive yet unnecessary appendages of a host of high-salaried officers will have to prove the neces-

sity of their existence at the cost of the taxpayers, or gradually cease to quarter themselves upon the national resources.

These are a sample of the subjects which the parliaments of the future will have to deal with in no hesitating or faltering manner. Yet this is the period at which men like Mr. Chaplin and Mr. Lowther select for asking the nation to assist them in putting back the hands of Time. Those who have not the advantage of a personal knowledge of these two gentlemen would scarcely believe that, apart from this particular craze of inviting the people to tax their food in order to help landowners to increase their rent, that both of them are men of good average intelligence and both of them, politics apart, exceedingly pleasant men to know and equally amusing to watch and hear. The working classes are about as likely to vote subsidies to game preserves as they are to vote the food tax to enable the Lords to increase their incomes. On foreign and colonial affairs the democracy will not, in my opinion, be belligerent. Every one who knows the British people knows that they carry what is in homely phraseology termed "a stiff upper lip." Jingo they are not. The parliaments that meddle least in foreign affairs will best reflect the desires of the people. Strong and ready to defend our rights, a hearty and sympathising word, or, if duty demands it, a helping hand to the oppressed, will be the motto of the new electorate. In colonial matters their policy will be Liberal, but firm and strong in the matter of defence, without unnecessary alarm at the colonial extension of other nations. And here let me say, speaking for myself, I would prefer Germany as a colonial neighbour to any other European nation, nor am I in the least excited or alarmed at the forward movement recently adopted by Prince Bismarck. Our duty is a common sense one, to act in a fair and friendly way toward those in whose company we are inevitably compelled to dwell. The speech made by Mr. Chamberlain on the 5th of last January, in Birmingham, undoubtedly gave full expression on many subjects to the feelings and opinions of the great mass of the Liberal workmen of Great Britain, and in no part did he more accurately reflect my own than when he said, speaking of German annexation, "Suspicion, irritation, and nervousness, which seem to characterise a certain school of politicians amongst us are, to my mind, altogether inconsistent with the dignity of a great nation, whose resolution to suffer no wrong should make it slow to take or give offence." Of Egypt I think it may truly be said that the people wish that we were well out of it. No other statesman except Mr. Gladstone could have secured the people's forbearance on this question for so long a time. The bondholders have cause for earnest prayer that the present Prime Minister may be spared to settle the Egyptian difficulty on fair terms for their interest. No other man has his mighty influence to restrain the people from cutting the nation adrift from these supposed obligations to protect what is



thought by many to be questionable transactions. Strict pledges will be required of Members of the future that England shall not drift into other such international sloughs of despond.

To return again to the question of Parliamentary reform, the future composition of parliament and government, it is well that it should be clearly understood the passing of the Seats Bill must not be regarded as a final settlement of the reform question. Plurality of votes is not extinguished by the Representation of the People's Act. No settlement of the question can be accepted which does not limit one man to one vote. Manhood suffrage has yet to be obtained; really equal electoral districts have yet to be secured; the relief of candidates from the returning officers' charges is not yet provided for, and the payment of members is a question to be settled by a future Reform Bill. All these planks of the Radical platform must be built up before the electoral structure can be regarded as complete. The question of payment of members brings me back to that of labour candidates in the next Parliament. From my experience of constituencies, I do not anticipate that many workmen will be returned simply because they are workmen and trades-unionists. Unionists are not sufficiently grouped in any special localities for this purpose, except in mining districts. The labour candidates will, as a rule, have to be political as well as social. The effect of trade association is to broaden men's minds, and very few candidates will have sufficient support from electors to carry them into Parliament on trade questions only. On the other hand, the candidate who is not sound on trade and social questions will stand but a poor chance in any working class division.

As the desire to be represented by their own class grows amongst the labouring people, the proposal for the payment of members will also increase in popularity. The great hindrance to the progress of this question is, and has been, the very general belief that members are remunerated at three to five guineas a day for committees and commissions, also that the refreshment departments at the House of Commons are for the free use of members of the house. A county solicitor, experienced in electioneering matters, congratulated me, on my entry into Parliament in 1880, on the ground that it would very materially increase my income by the payment for committee work. A well-to-do tradesman in one of our largest manufacturing towns, in his condolence with me in the late sittings of the house, remarked that it was quite right we should always have plenty of hot food provided for us free of charge. In 1883 it was reported to me by an old fellow worker in my trade that in North London the belief was general in my craft that I had in the course of three years' membership of the House of Commons received sufficient money from committees and commission work to set up a house and carriage, a big house, and a staff of servants. All arguments to the contrary are

met with the very reasonable query : If there is no pay why should candidates spend so much money and time in parliamentary work ? This delusion is being gradually dispersed, and side by side with this evaporation will grow the sensible and just determination to pay such of the members of the house whose limited resources require it.

There is one feature of the labour representation movement which does not appear to have been reckoned with up to the present, and it relates to the share which workmen must indisputably have in the national executive. The Education Act of 1870 is doing its work. The strong brain-power of the artisan class is slowly but surely receiving the polish and the culture incident to a sound elementary education supplemented by the University Extension Schemes, and from other sources of intellectual training. Many of those who will enter Parliament in a few years' time, direct from the mine and the workshop, will be capable of executive work, and the people will surely insist upon direct representation in the Cabinet.

There is an impression abroad that the House of Lords have now received a new lease of power by the course they have recently taken on the Franchise Bill. I think there are few things more certain of accomplishment by the new Parliament than that of the abolition of hereditary right to legislation. No logical or reasonable defence appears to be possible in support of the hereditary system in law making, and it would be absurd to suppose it can for long escape its inevitable doom.

As a Liberal, I do most earnestly hope that the Prime Minister will again be our standard-bearer at the next General Election. I trust I may be permitted, though with great diffidence, to say that however strongly some of the Whigs and the ambitious sections of the Liberal party may deplore the evidences of what they call Cæsarism or hero worship, the fact remains that the great mass of the English people regard Mr. Gladstone with the greatest reverence and veneration. I have seen in a few cases similar exhibition of devotion between a worthy son and a noble father. I know of no other illustration that would adequately convey to the mind the height and depth of the affection of the people for their political chief. They believe in his earnestness, in his fidelity to principle ; his eloquence appeals to their hearts and stirs their best emotions. On his part, he understands them and trusts them. He is the friend who never deceived them ; with him at their head, all things are possible for the people.

HENRY BROADHURST.

## II.

THOSE who understand the relative positions occupied by parties in the past, are endeavouring to forecast the extent to which the " Revolution of 1884 " will interfere with calculations based upon certain

defined lines. The Reform Act of 1867 did not introduce many new complications, and up to the present time the issue at elections has been mainly between Liberal and Conservative policy, being departed from only by the influence of vested interests and a few local considerations. The forces which have held the great Liberal party together since 1828 have been religious, political, and civil liberty. Any separation of this agency would have prevented that unity of action which, in crises that have convulsed the nation, has preserved its sagacity, forced reforms in our constitution, and may have saved the country from open rebellion. When manhood suffrage is conceded, a more equal distribution of political power obtained, and a recognition by the State of the ancient custom of the payment of members, a satisfactory settlement of political rights will have been accomplished. For this the country is prepared to wait. In the meantime its energies will be redoubled, and devoted to questions of more direct bearing upon the social status; great economic subjects matured by the minds and determination of the people, and rendered necessary by the condition of the country.

The new political power will be added to the old, and men who have refrained from taking an active part in what is known as "party politics" are prepared to enter into the battle for victories which will give the people a certainty of work and a keener conception and enjoyment of life. What, then, will form the battle-ground? Mr. Chamberlain, in recently addressing the artisans of Birmingham, gave the keynote. He wanted to know—"What is to be the nature of the domestic legislation of the future? . . . How to promote the greater happiness of the masses of the people? . . . Now, if you will go back to the origin of things, you will find that, when our social arrangements first began to shape themselves, every man was born into the world with natural rights—with a right to a share in the great inheritance of the community—with a right to a part of the land of his birth."

Will this policy, if carried out, enable the masses to feed and clothe themselves without violating the principles of political economy? This the working men who are actively looking into their social condition, and who every day are becoming more enlightened as to the systematic way in which legislation of the past has robbed them of rights and property, maintain it will:—1. By removing the power of an owner of great landed estates to entail his holding, leaving him and his successors free to sell or divide the land. 2. All waste land capable of cultivation and lands used for sporting purposes to be utilised for the food supply of the country. This would find work for the surplus labour market, and stop the perpetuation of the scandal that, while tens of thousands of honest, able-bodied subjects of the realm are crying for bread, millions of acres of lands lie idle. 3. The game laws to be abolished. The community, with its quickened pulse

of political interest and power, will refuse to continue laws made by and solely for sportsmen, and which cruelly imprison men who have committed no moral offence. The cost of keeping an army of policemen for the detection of poaching and the havoc done to crops by game is no inconsiderable matter. 4. The cheaper transfer of land and property, making the charges more in accordance with reasonable business transactions, and removing the present vicious and restrictive tariffs legalised as "law charges." 5. The restitution of illegal enclosures, for which Mr. Jesse Collings is fighting, would restore waste lands and commons filched from the people since 1800, even without the sanction of Parliament.

When these reforms are effected, twenty-five million acres of land can be inspected with a view of finding employment for many who now crowd our workhouses. They are wanted to keep the labourer to the soil and remove the necessity of sending his children to throng our centres of industry, competing with the artisans, lowering the rate of wages, and curtailing the legitimate profits which capital can fairly claim. By removing these artificial restrictions, not only would this influx cease, but the number of actual producers increase as the surplus labour would be drawn again to the land. All the advantages which would accrue cannot be stated here. But who shall exaggerate the beneficent influence of legislation of this character? It would create a healthy home trade, and the people being better fed and more independent would take increased interest on questions of Imperial policy and on matters belonging to local self-government. Confiscation or spoliation of private property is not wanted, but a discontinuance of huge monopolies which are a detriment to the general well-being. The incidence of taxation by which large landed proprietors escape their proportion of national and local responsibility is an integral part of land law reform. By the 29th George III. chap 6, 1789, it was enacted that the land tax should not increase with the increased value of the land. Thus the four shillings in the pound has continued to be paid on an assessment made so far back as 1692. The increased annual value of all lands since that time has made this tax simply a nominal sum, and instead of yielding thirty-five million pounds yearly to the Exchequer, only a little over one million is so received. In like manner the death duties are evaded, large estates paying a small percentage of succession duty only. Small legacies are burdened with a payment of ten per cent., and in this way the struggling population are unfairly dealt with.

In all large towns the ground landlord is free from local obligation but reaps all the advantages. The property owner or the tenant may have to sewer the land, pave the foot-road, pay increased rates and taxes, but the first charge on the property is still free from any of these responsibilities. At the expiration of the lease the ground landlord claims not only the property, but the reversion entitles him

to the unearned increment which belongs to the people. The original and made ground rents should be subject to the same conditions as is the increased annual value of the property. The principle of Mr. Broadhurst's Bill, giving leaseholders the power to purchase the "fee simple," if taken up by the Radical party, will find ardent supporters among all classes of the community. It is because we are a numerically small freeholding nation that we possess an unprecedentedly great leasehold interest. This reform would be deeply appreciated. Its importance is of a magnitude which cannot be exaggerated, and leaseholders are prepared to pay any reasonable compensation for the advantage. The toiling masses now possess an enhanced political power; what will they do with it? Will the new and enlarged force act with the Conservative party, or join the robust Liberal or Radical cause led by Mr. Chamberlain and other advanced statesmen? The trades unionists and other working men have during the past ten years developed a strong desire to be directly represented. The return to Parliament of the late Mr. Macdonald and Messrs. Broadhurst and Burt has proved a successful experiment, acknowledged by the Liberal party, and has given unmixed satisfaction to the people.

The Trades-union Congress, perhaps the purest representative annual gathering which considers social legislation, whenever it meets urges working men all over the country to support the principle of direct representation of labour. In all directions artisans are occupying seats in town councils, on school boards and boards of educational and charitable institutions. This force is at work, and with its following is determined to extend its actual representative capacity. It claims that it can more efficiently discharge the duties required of it than the average imperial or local representative. It holds that there are questions on which neither Liberals nor Conservatives have any desire for legislation. These subjects include the amendment of the Employers' Liability Act, enginemmen in charge of boilers to have certificates of fitness, the reform of the Magistracy and Jury Laws, &c. Labour representatives would also join others in insisting that royal dowries should be voted by a less lavish hand, and support a searching inquiry into the pension list, the perpetual portion of which they would try to abolish. Also support an inquiry into the endowed charity funds, and where perverted from the original intention of the donors direct them to their proper channel. Mr. Chamberlain's efforts to protect our seamen, it need scarcely be said, are supported by the labouring classes in almost every part of the United Kingdom, and yet with a House of Commons as at present constituted, vested interests are so powerful that human life, with which the Bill deals, has to be sacrificed to love of gain.

It is understood that Sir Charles Dilke intends to bring in a Bill dealing with poor law reform, and no doubt it will recommend that the property qualification be abolished. Working men who are

all rated to the poor can then make inquiries into the whole system of in and out-door relief. A member of a trade society is entitled to substantial benefits in the direction of out-of-work pay, superannuation, and funeral allowance, and pays no more for the advantages than he is rated to maintain the poor, and receives them in the same spirit as an article supplied to him over the counter in a retail shop. As a member of the community or of his society, he sacrifices none of his independence nor does he forfeit his voting power. If, however, by misfortune a citizen requires support from the rates, although able bodied and willing to work, he is refused out-door relief and is informed that he and his family can "go into the house;" the authorities from experience knowing that only a small percentage of such applicants will so degrade and pauperise themselves. By the returns of some of the Boards of Guardians, we find the cost of each pauper is about 7s. 10d. per week, and about equally divided between maintenance and establishment charges. Thus it will be seen that to maintain a man, his wife and three children, the sum of £1 19s. 2d. is required of the ratepayers. The obvious question here arises, would any working man earning a similar sum and having the same number to support, consider that he was in a pauperised condition? This surely points to the question as to whether our poor law system is mismanaged or a huge mistake.

Free education by the State is fast becoming ripe for settlement. The extraordinarily large number of free orders issued by board schools, the payment of school fees by guardians, the cost of collecting the school-pence and enforcing compulsion consequent upon parents not having the amount required, the unjust want of uniformity in the school fees, and the loss to local rates by a reduction of the grant on average attendance, are complications which, in the interest of the general public, require due consideration.

Legislation of this character would remove the cause for, and necessity of, improved dwellings for the poor, by making all willing to work independent of constitutional charity, which tends more to pauperise than ennoble.

The working men are acute observers as to whom they can depend upon for any reasonable portion of this domestic policy. This dependence must be on men of public spirit who from purity of motive recognise principles in proportion to the good which they will confer on the greatest number. Who, then, are these men of public spirit? Are they to be found in the ranks of the Conservative party? Those who have been foremost in advocating what is known as an "active foreign policy," and would impoverish the nation by placing an artificial value on our food supply, and by the imposition of protective tariffs increase the price of commodities required to carry on our

great commercial enterprise, are not to be trusted with the future prosperity of the labouring classes.

The much-vaunted cry of the Tories for meddling with foreign complications in which neither honour nor prestige is at stake, but for party purposes assumed, is seen through and understood to mean lucrative position for friends of the aristocracy, and for the time being practically giving a "blank cheque" on the national purse. For a short time the Church, the parson, and the squire, together with the fossilised Tory farmer, who, as a drowning man clutches a straw, clings to the "Will-o'-the-Wisp" Protection, may restrain many of the agricultural labourers. This, however, cannot be of long duration, as the quickening influence and fruits of a Socialistic treatment will act as a tonic on their low-beating pulse, and invigorate the political nerve which is even to be found with some degree of animation in what ought to be known as a bold peasantry.

The progress of our artisans is known to the farm labourer, and there are not wanting indications that he too is desirous of emulating their example and freeing himself from hateful patronage which for so long has yoked him as a serf. The sequel to the Revolution of 1884 must, in the very spirit and nature of the times, lighten the national burden and tighten the forces to be used in the march of progress. Our political liberty, civil rights, and religious equality have been handed to us by the Liberal party. The past history of that party is an earnest of what we may expect in the future. It is already in the field with most of the questions here dealt with, and to this and no other power can the labour party add its forces. To maintain the unity of the whole will not be so difficult as some who are simmiring with uneasiness would fain have us believe. A due regard to the natural requirements of certain populous districts will prevent any Liberal constituency being placed in jeopardy. This will be the duty of all prominent members connected with this progressive power.

A TRADES UNION OFFICIAL.

### III. .

Thanks to the indefatigable and uphill labours of the conscientious agitator, of whom the populace of the towns have no conception, English agricultural labourers have persistently demanded their electoral rights, and the Franchise Act is in their hands to-day. The agricultural labourers did not concern themselves greatly in the first instance with the question of the Redistribution of Seats. Their simple claim was to be admitted to citizenship, and although those of us who, by force of circumstances, found ourselves in position as chosen leaders, recognised the ulterior importance of the Redistribution of Seats and a more sensible adjustment of political power, our main effort centred itself

upon the demand for an extension of Household Suffrage to the counties. We knew that it was quite impossible to accomplish the one without creating a still greater necessity than already existed for the other. The momentary effervescence, caused by the course pursued by the House of Lords, provoked excessive irritation among the peasants, and had not the Peers yielded, it is quite certain that, before this time, a demand would have reached every member of the House of Commons from thousands of hamlets and villages for another "Revolution"—a Revolution of 1885—a demand that no amount of compromising could have stifled—a universal and indignant shout for the abolition of the House of Lords. But it should not be imagined that with the passing of the Franchise Bill the question of the constitution of the House of Lords has been indefinitely shelved. The agricultural labourers, and especially their leaders, are not likely to forget the taunts levelled at them, first by Lord Salisbury, then by Sir Stafford Northcote, and lastly by the whole mass of the lesser lights of the Conservative party. It astonishes the agricultural labourers not a little to be told, perhaps somewhat facetiously, that the Tory party have suddenly become their friends and champions. And, be the Tories to-day friends or otherwise, the agricultural labourers will not forget that for several years the Conservatives whipped up their forces in the House of Commons to throw out, first Mr. Trevelyan's motion, and then the Government Bill itself. They are aware that the Conservatives, finding themselves defeated, at last pursued the course customary to them on such occasions—they fell back upon the standing Conservative majority in the House of Lords, and they know how scornfully their hopes were shattered by the Peers. These are elementary truths, and the candidate who credits the agricultural labourers with being so foolish as to forget them will discover his error to his cost. The topic is resting until the proper season has arrived for again placing it in the front rank of subjects to be speedily dealt with. Every Liberal and Radical candidate, at any rate, must be prepared to make frank declarations in the new county constituencies respecting their views on the present position of, and overweening powers possessed by, the House of Lords. Then, too, the agricultural labourers are already debating the advisability of raising anew their demand for Manhood Suffrage. We shall encourage this opening agitation for Manhood Suffrage. The concession must come, and the sooner it does come the sooner will this class of agitation cease, and the Legislature really represent the manhood of the nation. Just as the opponents to the extended franchise averred that the peasants were not asking for, and were careless as to possessing, the Parliamentary vote, so, now that the Reform Bill is secure, they open fire from another direction. We are now told that the agricultural labourers do not know what they want, I will state some of the principal matters upon which they have expressed



emphatic opinions—reforms and improvements that they not only intend to demand, but which they will continue demanding until their petitions are acceded to.

The Education and School-Fees questions are a pregnant topic of grievance and discussion in every peasant's household and at every labourers' meeting. This is peculiarly the case with respect to the younger men, who, having themselves acquired partial education, realise the advantage of a good education to their children. Following upon Mr. Forster's Elementary Education Act of 1870 came the Agricultural Children's Act, this supplemental enactment turning out an absolute failure. Then we had Lord Sandon's Elementary Education Amendment Act, conferring compulsory powers in educational matters, together with authority to pay school-fees from the poor rates, upon Boards of Guardians. With this Act commenced the agricultural labourers' existing educational troubles. Village clergymen, perceiving an exceptional opportunity to enrich the Church schools at the public expense, immediately commenced ordering school-fees to be increased. One penny and twopence per week were the usual fees at that time. It is not unlikely that in the majority of villages national school-fees of from threepence to fourpence per child per week are now charged. I will furnish the most recent instance of this extortion. In a village on the borders of Kent and Sussex, almost entirely populated by agricultural labourers, a notice was issued that on and after January 1st, 1885, the school-fees would be increased from threepence to sixpence per week for each child in attendance. The parents of some of the children loudly complained, and assured the authorities that they were utterly unable to pay the higher fee. They were informed that if they could not themselves pay the fees they must apply to the Board of Guardians to pay the whole or a part of the fees for them. A few weeks prior to this several of the leading landowners and farmers in and around the village reduced the wages of their labourers by sums varying from 1s. 6d. to 2s. per week, that is to say, from 2s. 6d. down to 2s. 3d. and 2s. 2d. per day, with stoppages of work and wages during wet and frosty weather, and at slack seasons. I furnish this as one only of numerous similar incidents of the past seven years. What does it mean? That an agricultural labourer with steadily reducing wages; with probably 2s. 6d. per week to pay for cottage-rent; with, on the most favourable computation, about 9s. weekly left, upon which to maintain himself, wife, and little ones, is now required to still further trench upon his miserably bare cupboard in order to pay larger school-fees; or, as an alternative, must either degrade himself by making a first application for relief from the Board of Guardians, or become subject to legal prosecution, with the prospect of his financial troubles being still further enhanced by a fine and costs, and with the risk of being sent to gaol in default of payment. Is not this merciless persecution?

Is it surprising that agricultural labourers intend to seize this their great opportunity to demand legislative attention to this crying grievance? Thousands of the labourers, finding themselves unable to pay the increased fee, have applied to Poor Law Guardians. They frequently find the clergyman, who raised the fees, sitting at the board-room table in his capacity as Guardian of the Poor. The whole thing resolves itself into this, that the clergymen raise their Church school-fees, knowing the labourers cannot of themselves pay, and that in many parishes there is no other school at which the children can attend, urge the labourers to apply for parish help, and then attend the meetings of the Board of Guardians, and vote that the fees be paid from the pockets of the ratepayers. But apart from the foregoing, for myself I strongly uphold the principle that the education of the children of the poor should be a first duty of the State. Seeing the immense importance of the education question in its relationship to the future of this country, and how essential it is that our working people should be enabled to keep pace with the higher education of similar classes in other countries, is it politic that local grandees should be permitted to play fast and loose with the education of those who will be called upon to exercise so enormous an influence by means of their electoral rights upon the legislature of the kingdom? In the United States, in Canada, in all our Australasian colonies, and in New Zealand, as well as in several countries on the European continent, a free education is imparted to the children. No one who, like myself, has visited schools, instituted inquiries, and conversed with the children of the State free schools in America and in New Zealand, will dispute the assertion that the intellectual standard of the rising generations in those countries is infinitely superior to that of the children in our towns and agricultural districts.

It would be difficult to state whether the agricultural labourer is most interested in the Franchise, Free Education, or the reform of our landed system. When, at a recent Trades-union Congress, I introduced a resolution having for its object a reform of the Land Laws of Great Britain, a leading London daily journal declared that my resolution was out of place, that they failed to understand what concern the working classes had with primogeniture and entail and the general Land Laws of the country. I hold that there is nothing so intimately bound up with the everyday life of the agricultural labourer as the laws which govern the land he tills. All the evils of the system permeate downwards on to the agricultural labourer's shoulders. A variety of influences have operated against the labourer during the past eight years. Farms have been amassed, and a large proportion of the labourers have been dismissed; arable has been laid into pasture, and a shepherd with boys employed in lieu of the adult regular-going tillers of soil. In every department of agriculture machinery has robbed the labourer of the best-paid-for work.

The steam-plough, the hay-mowing and hay-making machines, the reaping-machines, the thrashing-machines have stolen from the labourer his haying and harvesting money. High farm-rents, tithes ordinary and tithes extraordinary, and the machinery have, between them, driven from their village homes tens of thousands of our sturdy peasantry. The census returns absolutely prove this assertion. Where are these people to-day? A certain number have emigrated, assisted by their colleagues and their Labourers' Unions; but myriads of them are at this moment increasing the population of the already overcrowded mining and manufacturing districts, or are cooped up, mostly unemployed, in the courts and alleys of our great cities and towns. Herein, then, is to be perceived the influence exercised upon the agricultural labourers by, and the interest the peasantry have in, the Land Laws of the country. Now, we have been telling the labourers, and, it being undeniable, they have believed it, that were land freed from certain oppressive laws, and from certain excruciating burdens, not one of them need leave their cottages, their villages or their country. Means must be devised to enable farmers and labourers to acquire the freeholds of the land they cultivate. No merely fractional reduction of rent will suffice. The secret of the advantageous position enjoyed by the wheat-growing farmers of our colonies and of America lies in the fact that the majority of them have no landlords to extort high rentals and to dictate impossible conditions of cultivation, and no tithe-paid clergymen to enter their farms and seize one-tenth of the produce of their industry. We must assist the farmers to acquire the freeholds of farms of reasonable dimensions, in addition to assisting the labourers to become peasant proprietors. Necessarily there must be compulsory powers of purchase, and for this end a land court would have to be constituted for valuation and routine purposes. Assuming that some such scheme were in operation, that many large owners whose estates are deeply encumbered are anxious to sell, that the customs or laws respecting primogeniture and entail are abolished, there would then gradually come into operation a healthy process of subdivision of land, which in one generation would absolutely turn the scale in favour of our home agriculturists. But rent is not the only financial burden to be considered. It is not necessary to touch the question of the disestablishment of the State Church in dealing with the Tithes. Fifty years ago the country was in an uproar respecting this impost, and the difficulty was salved over by the passing of the Tithes Commutation Act, the provisions of which converted the ordinary tithe of one-tenth of the farm produce into a rent-charge to be collected from the landowner in lieu of the farmer. This cunning device cut the sting from the burden for the time being. It was that or abolition. The landowners and the parsons

decided to choose the lesser of what they considered to be two evils. But farm-rents were subsequently immensely increased, the land-owner speedily recouped himself the tithe payments, and still continues to do so. The annual sum charged upon the land as ordinary tithes, mainly for the support of the Church of England, amounts to between four and five millions sterling. Two-thirds of this enormous sum are paid directly or indirectly by the farmers. In addition to the ordinary tithe there is a second or extraordinary tithe—and verily, an extraordinary tithe it is! A more monstrous and unjustifiable impost upon agricultural industry could scarcely be conceived. Mr. Gladstone recently advised agriculturists to turn their attention to fruit and vegetable cultivation as a partial remedy for their troubles, and from the general point of view the advice was good. Why do not the farmers do so? Because they are aware—and I presume it would be treason to assert that the right hon. gentleman may not be aware—that immediately upon a farmer turning arable land into vegetable, fruit, or hop plantations, the village clergyman steps forth to demand a second or, as it is termed, an extraordinary tithe. This second tithe is chargeable, not upon the landowner, but on the tenant-cultivator, be he farmer or be he labourer, the ordinary tithe being still chargeable as heretofore. There are about 67,000 acres of hop plantations in England, and the average of the charge for extraordinary tithe is from 15s. to 19s. per acre. In some places, however, not less than 30s. per acre is levied. There are in England 180,000 acres of orchard land, with extraordinary tithes ranging from 4s. to 18s. per acre. There are 41,000 acres of market gardens upon which extraordinary tithes are levied from 3s. 6d. to 6s. per acre. Thus, although it is very desirable that farmers should follow Mr. Gladstone's advice and cultivate these more profitable articles of consumption, in the majority of instances farmers decline to do so, because they know that, while they are expending their own capital to the tune of from £15 to £25 per acre in creating their plantations, the village parson is, like a spider in his web, furtively watching the progress of the work, and will presently come down, armed with the authority of the law, to claim the larger share of profits, and to seize and sell without process of law, in case of default. The agricultural labourers are generally well acquainted with all these matters, and have passed innumerable resolutions at their village meetings, calling upon their leaders to spare no efforts to bring about a reform of the land laws and the abolition of the tithes.

The peasantry are also anxiously watching for the introduction of a County Government Bill. They are determined that sooner or later the administration of the bequests of moneys and lands for the benefit of the poor shall be inquired into and rescued from the

frequently occurring misappropriation by trustees, and from the neglectful oversight of the Charity Commissioners. They had hoped to find Mr. Jesse Collings's admirable Labourers' Allotment Act impartially administered. They have been grossly deceived. Local trustees, mostly clergymen and farmers as they are, or persons intimately associated with them, place every possible obstacle in the path of the labourers in their efforts to secure parish charity land for allotment gardens. In one county the agricultural labourers of about fifty parishes have complied with the Act, and delivered formal applications to local trustees. In only four instances have the applications been acceded to. Subterfuges of all descriptions are invented to prevent the labourers getting upon the land. The appeal to the Charity Commissioners is a delusion and a snare. In no single instance, in the county alluded to, have the Charity Commissioners ordered local trustees to comply with the provisions of the Act. An abundance of evidence is forthcoming to prove that Mr. Collings's indictment of the Charity Commissioners is amply justified, and that the agricultural labourers have in this matter received scurvy treatment at their hands. On the question, too, of the general charitable bequests the labourers of most of the villages are warm, and it is high time that some authority be created to take charge of, and to justly administer, these trifling tokens of mercy left for the benefit of the poor. For instance, I have before me a case in which a benefaction of 2s. 6d. each alternate year to every poor person in the parish is in the hands of the churchwardens as trustees. In this same parish, some years ago, a number of the parishioners, at a meeting, resolved to charge upon themselves a voluntary church-rate of 1s. 1½d. per house per annum. Several of the poorest of the cottagers in the village have been unable, and others, being Nonconformists, have declined, to pay the church-rate. Last Christmas the churchwarden, in distributing the half-crowns, deducted therefrom the amount of the church-rate, handing to the poor of the parish the pitiful balance. This is but one of a cloud of similar cases. A vast number of these small parish bequests have disappeared altogether, and perhaps are not now recoverable. At any rate it is easy to prove that the poorer class of the peasantry can show good cause against permitting local charities any longer to remain in the hands of private and positively irresponsible trustees. Apart from the larger questions involved in the movement to secure local government for the counties, the Bill, whenever it is forthcoming, and providing that it is calculated to secure its object, will receive an enthusiastic support from the agricultural labourers.

The introduction of the Redistribution Bill has mightily pleased, not only the better-informed agricultural labourers, but also the other classes of working men in the county divisions. Whatever may be

the feeling of the electors in the large towns as to single-member constituencies, the idea is immensely popular in the counties. But it is clear that provision must be made, so that a majority and not the minority shall elect the member. It requires no stretch of the imagination to suppose that a dummy candidate may, if necessity calls for it, admirably suit the purposes of a not too fastidious opposing candidate. The agricultural labourers will most assuredly rank themselves in favour of the demand for a second ballot in cases where there are superfluous candidates. Nor can I impress upon the reforming party too earnestly the desirability of satisfying a doubt sedulously disseminated by Conservative partisans that the Ballot itself is not secret. Instances have recently been brought to my knowledge where Conservative landowners and farmers have called their labourers together to talk over—of course in a friendly and confidential spirit—the questions of the day. The advantages of protection and the insecurity of the Ballot are choice topics of conversation. Labourers are assured that parish authorities know how the votes are cast; and as the polling-booth must in many places be a parish school-room, and as the local officials are the persons who have charge of the electoral machinery—most of the officials being of necessity on friendly terms with neighbouring squires—colour is given to the doubt.

The foregoing are the chief topics of interest to the peasantry, and if the Liberal party unhesitatingly and boldly place these questions upon their programme for the next Parliament, the votes of the majority of the agricultural labourers are secure to them. The material difficulty of the moment is to open up communications with the small hamlets and villages distant from railway stations, and especially with those labourers who reside in cottages upon farms in outlandish places, far away from the villages themselves. Regular Liberal and Conservative agents will scarcely appreciate the task of travelling about the wilds in search of stray labourers, and yet there are thousands of such men, and they must somehow be communicated with. It is impossible for candidates to canvas them. The only successful method of reaching them is to place means at our disposal so that we may employ, during the next twelve months, intelligent men of their own class—men known to the labourers, and enjoying their confidence. In my own districts, the Tory-ridden south-eastern counties, the work accomplished by twenty men of this description would be invaluable. Our labours, however, in this direction must assuredly be backed with robustness by Liberal and Radical candidates. By this means and, as I verily believe by this means only, we should achieve victory, and educate the minds of the new voters to a higher level of political thought at the same time.

ALFRED SIMMONS.

## THE UPPER ENGADINE IN WINTER.

IN the east of Switzerland, amongst the highlands of the Grisons, lies a long, broad valley, which, although out of the track of the majority of tourists, is visited in summer by some thousands of English people in search of health or pleasure. This upper valley of the Inn, or Engadine, can also boast of a winter season, during which St. Moritz is the home alike of persons suffering from pulmonary complaints, nervous diseases, and other disorders, and of those who come for the skating and tobogganning. So long ago as the winter of 1867—68 an entry occurs in the visitors' book at the Kulm Hotel, recording the advantage which the writer, suffering from disease of the lungs, had experienced from a five months' sojourn there. Similar testimony was furnished by persons staying at St. Moritz during the next two seasons. After this, notwithstanding such favourable witness to its curative capabilities, and the increasing reputation of Davos as a resort for consumptive patients, no one remained at St. Moritz during the winter months until 1876. This was owing partly to the want of local enterprise in advertising it as a health resort, partly to want of preparation in the shape of stoves and double windows, to enable invalids to continue there during the cold season. Since 1876, however, the number of winter guests has increased. This winter upwards of one hundred and ninety people are spending several months there, and Davos, whose climate is similar to that of Engadine, bids fair in a few years to be overcrowded. It is, consequently, very desirable that the number of such health resorts should be multiplied, and that those which are adapted for invalids should become well known, in order that they may be put in a state of preparation for the class of persons likely to come to them.

Places in the Alps, to be entirely suitable in winter for "invalids," should possess, if possible, a sheltered position, not too high up on a hillside, should be free from wind, exposed to the sun, sufficiently remote from running water to prevent mists reaching the hotel, and accessible to the outside world by carriage-roads. The Upper Engadine, which at present offers four winter health resorts—St. Moritz, Samaden, Pontresina, and Maloja—can be reached by six great Alpine routes: the Julier and Albula from Chur, the Bernina and Maloja from Italy, the Fluela from Davos, and the road from Austrian Tyrol. Of these the passes most likely to be used by English people are the Julier and Maloja, since the others are either higher or more exposed to avalanches. A journey from England can be accomplished in the shortest time by crossing the Julier, but

this involves a twelve hours' drive in an open sledge—within the last week or two a closed sledge has been used in crossing this pass—while by the Maloja the journey is made *à la* the St. Gothard by railway as far as Chiavenna, thence to St. Moritz by open sledge in eight hours. The Maloja is almost the lowest pass in Switzerland, being 1,500 feet lower than the Julier, a consideration of great importance for delicate persons in winter or even in late autumn. The nature of the passage over these passes varies with the weather. In winter the summer diligence is replaced by a series of small sledges, each drawn by one horse and holding two passengers. As a rule, only the first and last sledges have drivers. Along the narrow track formed in the snow the procession walks or trots, according to the degree of the slope. The horses are accustomed to their work, and follow their leader without the use of the reins. But if they should chance to be fresh to their duties and leave the track, they will flounder more than knee-deep in the powdery snow, on which the occupants of the sledge will then usually find themselves deposited without violence or hurt. If the road is in good condition, the weather fine, as it generally is in the Alps in winter, and the traveller well clad in warm wraps or furs, a day's drive over the snow is one of the pleasantest experiences imaginable. Starting in the early morning, the keen, cold air makes the flesh tingle. Then is the time, before the sun has gained full power, to put on warm overcoats, and to cover up the ears and the hands. As we go on, the sun, shining through the thin air, begins to burn fiercely, and we are glad to discard one by one many coverings which were necessary earlier in the day. This peeling process may continue until we feel surprised at the lightness of the covering required, but these rejected wraps will have to be donned again as evening advances. The combination of warm, bright sun, with the cold, crisp air, of which one is scarcely conscious, constitutes the great charm of the Alpine winter climate. The nerves and muscles are braced, so that exercise is not merely pleasant, but almost indispensable, and the only life tolerable is one spent in the open air, either basking in the sunshine or carrying on the various amusements of the season. If the weather in crossing a pass should happen to be unfavourable—in which case common sense would recommend that the journey should be deferred—the traveller may gain an experience to be remembered with anguish for the rest of his life. When lowering clouds discharge their burden of snow which, flung about in huge wreaths by a furious wind, blinds traveller, driver, and horses, and so covers up the track that the animals can scarcely make headway against the raging storm, then, despite the skill of the driver and the sagacity of his beasts, who, if well used to their work, will keep to the track even when deeply covered with snow, the situation will become most perilous. The worst that can happen is, that the accumulation of drifts and



the force of the storm may render it impossible to proceed, and sledges and horses will be rapidly snowed up. The sledges are accompanied on stormy days by two or three of the roadmen, whose duty is to keep the track in order by shovelling fresh snow upon it in the places that are worn. They follow the sledges and, when necessary, dig them out or cut through drifts. Thus, by slow and painful stages, the travellers may reach their haven of safety, to suffer for days in eyes and skin, if not more severely, from the terrible exposure.

But there is no need to wait till the passes are covered with snow before making the journey to this upland valley. There are many reasons why travellers should arrive in autumn. The weather is then not so cold, and newcomers can get accustomed to the air of the Engadine before the severe weather sets in. The autumn, too, possesses recommendations of its own. September is usually a glorious month, and boasts a larger proportion of cloudless or only partially clouded days than any other month in the year. The woods, which in summer are masses of sombre green, become resplendent with gorgeous tints of crimson and gold, reminding one in many ways of the beauties of the American "Indian summer." The mountains are ablaze with colour, and the eye wanders up their sides to rest on their snow-clad summits, which stand out in clear-cut relief against the deep-blue sky. All these manifold beauties, mirrored in the unruffled surface of the mountain lakes, form a rare combination of rich and harmonious colouring. The snow which falls at this season instead of rain, usually remains on the highest parts of the mountains, but does not long continue in the valley, and the sublimity of the view is thus improved by the dignity which this white mantle lends to the surrounding hills. The autumn, however, like the spring, is, in the Engadine, a transition period of very brief duration. Soon the snowfalls become more heavy, and the "snowing-in" begins. In two or three days several feet may fall, and one morning finds the ground thickly covered with a garment which will remain for about five months. The time at which this, which marks the beginning of winter, takes place, varies considerably in different years; but it is pretty safe to average its duration from November 14 to May 1.

The "snowing-in" period is often supposed to be an extremely objectionable and almost intolerable time. Like so many other things, it is not so bad as it is painted. No doubt the thawing of fresh-fallen snow is not pleasant, and the large quantity which often and mud tends to make it still more disagreeable; but in a high-lying Austrian <sup>the</sup> St. Moritz, for instance, the water quickly runs off, and English people the extreme dryness of the air large quantities of moisture higher or more so. This transition period does not last long. A few can be accomplished weather lead, as a rule, to the heavy downfall, and

then a spell of calm, cloudless days will usually follow. Wheel vehicles are replaced by sledges, snow gaiters are put on, and visitors as well as natives give themselves up to the pleasures of tobogganning. The toboggan is a small sledge, about 42 inches long by 14 inches wide, on iron runners. The rider drags it to the top of a steep snow slope, on which the snow has been beaten down so as to become hard, sits astride it with feet slightly projecting in front, and allows himself to slide. Soon he is rushing through the air at a tremendous pace; all his attention is bent on turning the corners neatly and with the least possible interference with the motion of the machine. Faster and faster he goes down the steep incline, with a cry of "Achtung!" to warn anyone off the course; at the same time he keeps a sharp look-out for dangers ahead, until he reaches the long piece on the level which ends his journey. Strange to say, there are very few accidents, although the speed is considerable, often amounting to more than twenty-five miles an hour. The mode of guiding a toboggan is either by pressing lightly with the heels on the snow on the side towards which one wishes to go, or by using one of two sticks held in the hands. By pressing both feet the brake is applied and the machine readily stopped, except when the upper surface of the track is glazed with ice; in this case a halt is made by running off the course into the soft snow on either hand. Toboggan-runs can be made on any sloping ground. The snow requires to be first more or less consolidated on the surface to prevent the runners from sinking in. At St. Moritz, which is the only place in the Engadine where many visitors have stayed in the winter, there are three runs. One goes through the village, then along a road leading to the St. Moritz Baths, and finishes under the English Church. On this course there is always much uncertainty in turning the corners of the village street as to what may be encountered further on, and it is frequently necessary to exercise special care, and sometimes even to slacken speed, in passing sledges, as the horses drawing them are not always accustomed to toboggans provided not only with shouting riders, but often with jingling cow-bells. Another run at St. Moritz leads from the front of the Kulm Hotel, along the footpath, through a gate padded with sacks to diminish the discomfort of a collision; it then goes down a flight of steps, which, covered over and banked up with snow, give a very steep slope, turns sharp to the left, and so by one or two curves runs on to the frozen surface of the lake. No one who has not tried it can realise how much variety a course like this can supply in a short three minutes. Many were the occasions, during some races held there, on which the toboggan and its rider parted company, the first to perform a journey alone, the latter to be shot forward and buried in the snow. But the favourite run is by a steep footpath on the way to Samaden. Here, late in the season, when the track has

become glazed with ice, the speed is enormous, and there is one corner round which one always looks eagerly for the first peep of the highway to see if there are any sledges coming along the road, which might bring before one, in a very unpleasant manner, the dangers of a level crossing. When the track is in condition for fastest going this road is altogether cleared by the toboggan, a slight rise on one side of it giving a sufficient elevation to enable the machine to shoot over it, and come to ground some distance on the other side, thence to dash on at express speed towards its final leap. There is a feeling of boundless exhilaration in thus flying through the air which cannot be imagined unless it has been experienced. The only thing at all resembling it is riding on a locomotive engine, but the jolting and bumping in the latter case are absent on a good, though by no means on a bad, toboggan course, and the rider is much more master of his machine, which, though going at nearly equal speed, can be almost immediately brought to rest. The delight of this exciting sport may be much intensified if it be carried on by moonlight. Then the extreme cold of the night freezes the upper surface of the snow and makes the travelling faster than by day. There is a feeling of weirdness and doubt as one dashes into the masses of shadow projected from wall and gable. The attention is strained to the utmost to avoid any lurking perils that have to be detected by eyes dazed with passing from brilliant moonlight for an instant only into the darkness, thence to emerge with headlong speed into the brightness beyond.

As a winter amusement skating, of course, holds a high place. At the beginning of winter the rinks, of which at St. Moritz there are three, and one each at Samedan, Pontresina, and Maloja, are covered with people, old and young, men, women, and children, the majority of whom appear never to have been on skates before. The difficulties of balancing on two props, which long experience has enabled us to manage without even conscious effort on ordinary ground, are very much increased when the surfaces in contact are reduced to two narrow edges of steel; and the beginner, on these rinks has the misfortune of having all his tumbles on the hard, unyielding surface of a solid mass of ice. But these difficulties are speedily overcome, and much good skating can be seen on the rinks. So highly is the amusement appreciated that many persons come from England for a short holiday of a month or six weeks about Christmas in order to enjoy it. It sometimes happens that no snow falls whilst the five lakes in the Engadine are freezing over, and, in consequence, skating on them is possible. Such has been the case for several weeks this year. Many of the winter visitors, hale and invalid alike, spend the whole day, from sunrise to sunset, on the rinks, and this for the greater part of the four months during which the water continues frozen. Lunch is partaken of on benches on the

ice; and although surrounded by snow people are warmed, and even scorched, by the fierce heat of the sun, which is not only poured down directly on them, but also reflected from the surface of the snow and ice around. It is thus that so many invalids are here enabled to regain their strength. The power of the sun's action is shown by the bronzed appearance of those who leave the Engadine in the spring, whose countenances excite much attention and surprise from the pale-faced inhabitants of the plains. Very often persons skating find it necessary to hold up umbrellas and parasols to shelter them from the heat of the sun—a curious and unwonted sight.

It need hardly be pointed out that the only means of transport from one village to another is by sledges. These have usually only seats for two, with a board behind on which the driver stands, and are drawn by one horse. The motion is extremely pleasant. The vehicle glides along the hardened snow with a slight movement from side to side, due to the motion of the horse. The traffic on the high roads has beaten down the snow and made the track quite smooth, so that it is almost as easy to walk in winter as in summer. In other places the snow is so deep and powdery that a person sinks in up to his knees, and walking becomes excessively fatiguing. But, in spite of this, many sturdy pedestrians cover long distances, and some even ascend mountains. All the post routes are kept open, and walking along the hard snow is much practised, although the majority of people prefer some of the other forms of amusement. The ardour with which visitors in summer make excursions, has not yet seized upon those who come in the winter, but there is no reason why sledging parties should not be organised at that season as carriage excursions are in summer. Not unfrequently, however, people drive to the top of the adjacent passes and toboggan to the bottom.

The inhabitants of the villages carry on, during the winter, the trades which are more or less interrupted in the summer. All the time which is not occupied by more serious business is devoted to smoking, and numerous are the gatherings in the village restaurant for the consumption of beer and wine, and the retailing of local gossip. The living-rooms are kept warm by means of large stoves; and so important is it considered to retain all the heat possible, that windows are seldom opened for purposes of ventilation, so that very little fresh air finds access to the interior of the rooms, except by crevices in doors and windows. The same craving for warmth causes the sleeping-rooms, even in comparatively large houses, to be overcrowded; and in the older buildings the windows were made, for a similar reason, extremely small. In more modern structures the windows are larger, and double. If strangers should be tempted to visit any of these houses, they would be warmly welcomed by the inmates, who regard with interested surprise the irruption of foreigners during

the cold of winter into their remote and snow-bound valley. Of all the places in the Engadine which are available for a winter stay, St. Moritz is that most likely to be selected. This village stands about three hundred feet above the lake of the same name. The mountains rising three to five thousand feet above the valley on either side, afford complete protection from winds blowing in north-west and south-east directions, but those blowing up and down the valley meet with few obstacles to check them. In summer the warm air which rises from the plains of Lombardy comes over the low pass of the Maloja, and having been cooled by expansion in the upper regions of lower air-pressure, forms the refreshing valley-wind which is so familiar to all visitors to St. Moritz in the summer. It rises regularly about eleven o'clock in the morning, and dies away in the afternoon about three. This breeze, which is so pleasant in the hot months, would be intolerable in the winter, but at this season, owing to the universal covering of snow, there are not the same great differences of temperature in adjacent places to cause local winds, and consequently the only atmospheric disturbances that are perceived are those which reach the district from the outside.

At St. Moritz the largest hotel is the Kulm, and this is filled by a colony composed almost entirely of English people, of whom the minority are persons in search of health. The remainder is made up of caretakers, and of casuals who come for pleasure. So successful have the last two seasons proved at St. Moritz, that several hotels which have hitherto been closed are open this year. The great length of the corridors and the exceptionally large public rooms at the Kulm Hotel make it especially suited for a prolonged residence, and obviate that overcrowding which is injurious to health and trying to temper. The situation, not too high on the slope of a hill facing south, is one of the best that could be selected, since the cold air and mist sink down and collect at the bottom of the valley, so that there is a much higher temperature in the village than at the baths, which are three hundred feet below. This difference of temperature is especially noticeable in the early morning. In going from the village down to the lake, we pass from a perfectly clear, dry atmosphere into a region where, owing to the frozen vapour present, the air is filled by millions of small ice-crystals. These reflect from innumerable facets the rays of the sun, making the atmosphere seem filled with floating jewels, and at the same time produce a feeling of damp cold. Here, also, the surface of the snow and of any object which is exposed to the air is covered with those wonderful fabrics, large-sized lace-like hexagonal crystals of snow of all forms, radiant with gorgeous colours which vary with every movement of the observer, and are even more beautiful, because of their exquisite shapes, than the dew-diamonds on an English grass-field.

Sunshine lasts from 10.45 A.M. till 3 P.M. on the shortest day, and

these hours mark the limits within which most invalids find it desirable to remain out of doors. There is often a difference of more than 50° F. between the temperature in sun and shade. The sudden chill which accompanies sundown is remarkable. Sitting or walking one moment in full, bright sunshine, one suddenly becomes conscious of a coldness stealing over the earth as the sun passes down behind the mountains. Except when moonlight tobogganning is indulged in, it is not usual for people to go out walking in the evening, although the temptation to do so is strong from the unwonted brilliancy of the heavens. Indoors all kinds of creature comforts are attended to, and smoking and billiards, cards and conversation, pass away the winter evenings, with occasional diversions on a larger scale in the form of private theatricals, penny readings, concerts, and dancing. The last-named amusement absorbs much energy, and the crowning event of the season is a fancy-dress ball, in which a curious and miscellaneous collection of ancient and modern English dresses is usually associated with a series of interesting costumes of old Engadine beaux. Thus, despite the severe temperature outside, and contrary to the opinion of sympathising friends in England, it is possible for gaiety and good humour to hold high festival in the midst of this exiled band of English people spending the winter in one of the highest villages in the Alps.

The only other place in the Engadine at which any number of guests has stayed in winter is the Bernina Hotel at Samaden. No one who has ever been in this house can fail to appreciate the manner in which it is conducted. Unfortunately the town is not as high above the river as might be wished, and in consequence there are slight fogs in the morning, which, however, soon pass away. Its temperature is also less than that of the better-placed St. Moritz, and although the sun rises at Samaden somewhat sooner in the morning, it sets earlier, a defect which it shares with Pontresina. This village, so crowded in summer, has hitherto made no effort to attract winter visitors, but in future the admirably situated Hotel Enderlin will remain open all the year round. One of the largest hotels in Switzerland has been recently built at the Maloja, and it is kept open winter and summer alike. Although its arrangements appear to be everything that can be desired, its position is very unfortunate. It stands entirely unsheltered in the midst of the marshy land at the head of the Sils Lake, and at the beginning of the long Engadine valley. The mountains here form a kind of funnel, through which blow not only the Maloja wind of the summer months, but also during the winter those strong winds which accompany bad weather, reaching the Engadine from the Italian side. It is from this direction, we may observe, that nearly all the boisterous and unpleasant storms of wind, rain, and snow come.

In all these villages the best medical assistance can be obtained,

and no doubt English doctors, of whom there are three or four already, will come to the Engadine as the number of winter guests increases. The wonderful success which has attended a residence in the High Alps ensures the Engadine a very conspicuous position as a health resort, especially for persons with diseases of the lungs and weakness of the nerves. The splendid climate and air, the exhilaration, the vigour and the strength produced by them, the beauty of the mountains, as well as the comforts which are to be found in the hotels in a district half as high again as the top of the loftiest mountain in Great Britain, all conspire to furnish most powerful inducements equally to the weak and the strong. It is perhaps difficult to conceive any circumstances under which an invalid could be placed in which life would be more agreeable. And the abundant indications that he has around him of improvement in health among his fellow-sufferers is calculated to fill him with the greatest hope for his own future, and to make him more patient in enduring the enforced inaction against which he is so often disposed to rebel. Nor does the winter appear so long as might be supposed. The variety of amusements and the delights of the climate make it pass quickly away. As the days get longer and the sun's rays acquire more power, the melting of the snow becomes much more rapid. The brooks which for months have been frost-bound wake up into motion. The southern slopes first lose their white covering, and patches of brownish green appear—a delightful sight after the long monotony of endless snow. The meadows soon become bogs and the roads watercourses. Through the steep streets there are running streams, and, in the shade, miniature glaciers, which necessitate much care in walking. Then, as the snow disappears almost entirely from the roads, the inhabitants of the villages meet together to break through the large drifts. Little by little sledges are relegated to the upper parts of the passes, and finally the heavy, lumbering diligence once more travels along the whole road. With the general awakening of life and motion on the surface of the earth, the unbroken stillness of the winter gives place to winds of icy coldness blowing over the snow, surpassing English east winds in their fierce bitterness, and making existence barely tolerable in March and April. Then all who are able to leave, hasten their flight to other and more genial parts, carrying with them many pleasant recollections of a winter spent in a new way, amid the snow and ice of the Alps, and enabled by contrast the more keenly to appreciate the rich and varied beauty of foliage and colour that greet them on their arrival in lower-lying districts.

J. F. MAIN.

## REVIEW OF THE YEAR.

(NEWTON HALL, 1 JANUARY, 1885.)

THE opening of a new year again assembles us together to look back on the work of the year that is gone, to look faithfully into our present state, and to take forecast of all that yet awaits us in the visible life on earth, under the inspiring sense of the Great Power which makes us what we are, and who will be as great when we are not.

In the light of this duty to Humanity as a whole, how feeble is our work, how poor the result! And yet, looking back on the year that is just departed, we need not be down-hearted. Surely and firmly we advance. Not as the spiritualist movements advance, by leaps and bounds, as the tares spring up, as the stubble blazes forth, but by conviction, with system, with slow consolidation of belief resting on proof and tested by experience. If at the beginning of last year we could point to the formation of a new centre in North London, this year we can point to its maintenance with steady vigour, and to the opening of a more important new centre in the city of Manchester. Year by year sees the addition to our cause of a group in the great towns of the kingdom. Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Newcastle, already have their weekly meetings and their organised societies.

I make no great store of all this. The religious confidence in Humanity will not come about, I think, like the belief in the Gospel, or in the Church, or in any of the countless Protestant persuasions, by the formation of a small sect of believers, gradually inducing men to join some exclusive congregation. The trust in Humanity is an ineradicable part of modern civilisation: nay, it is the very motive power and saving quality of modern civilisation, and that even where it is encumbered by a conscious belief in God and Christ, in Gospel and salvation, or where it is disguised by an atheistical rejection of all religious reverence whatever. Positivists are not a sect. Positivism is not merely a new mode of worship. It is of small moment to us how numerous are the congregations who meet to-day to acknowledge Humanity in words. The best men and women of all creeds and all races acknowledge Humanity in their lives. For the full realisation of our hopes we must look to the improvement of civilisation; not to the extension of a sect. Let us shun all sects and everything belonging to them.

I shall say but little, therefore, of the growth of Positivist congregations. Where they are perfectly spontaneous and natural; where they are doing a real work in education; where they give solid



comfort and support to the lives of those who form them, they are useful and living things, giving hope and sign of something better. But I see evil in them if they are artificial and premature; if they spring out of the incurable tendency of our age towards sects; if they are mere imitations of Christian congregations; and, above all, if their members look upon them as adequate types of a regenerated society. The religion of Humanity, by its nature, is incapable of being narrowed down to the limits of a few hundreds of scattered believers and to casual gatherings of men and women divided in life and activity. And that for the same reason that civilisation or patriotism could not possibly be the privilege of a few scattered individuals. Where two or three are gathered together, there the Gospel may be duly presented, and God and Christ adequately worshipped. It is not so with Humanity. The service of Humanity needs Humanity. The only Church of Humanity is a healthy and cultured human society. It is the very business of Humanity to free us from all individualist religion, from all self-contained worship of the isolated believer. And though the idea of Humanity is able to strengthen the individual soul as profoundly as the idea of Christ, yet the idea of Humanity, the service of Humanity, the honouring of Humanity, are only fully realised in the living-organism of a humane society of men.

For this reason I look on a Positivist community rather as a germ of what is to come, one which may easily degenerate into a hindrance to true life in Humanity. The utmost that we can do now as an isolated knot of scattered believers is so immeasurably short of what may be done by a united nation, familiar from generation to generation with the sense of duty to Humanity, saturated from infancy with the consciousness of Humanity, and with all the resources of an organised public opinion, and a disciplined body of teachers, poets, and artists, to secure its convictions and express its emotions, that I am always dreading lest our puny attempts in the movement be stereotyped as adequate. Our English, Protestant habits are continually prompting us to look for salvation to sects, societies, self-sufficing congregations of zealous, but possibly self-righteous reformers. The egotistic spirit of the Gospel is constantly inclining us to look for a healthier religious ideal to some new religious exercises, to be performed in secret by the individual believer, in the silence of his chamber or in some little congregation of fellow-believers. Positivism comes, not to add another to these congregations, but to free us from the temper of mind which creates them. It comes to show us that religion is not to be found within any four walls, or in the secret yearnings of any heart, but in the right systematic development of an entire human society. Until there is a profound diffusion of the spirit of Humanity throughout the mass of some entire human society, some definite section of modern civilisation, there can be no

religion of Humanity in any adequate degree; there can be no full worship of Humanity; there can be no true Positivist life till there be an organic Positivist community to live such a life. Let us beware how we imagine, that where two or three are gathered together there is a Positivist Church. There may be a synagogue of Positivist pharisees, it may be; but the sense of our vast human fellowship—which lies at the root of Positivist morality; the reality of Positivist religion, which means a high and humane life in the world; the glory of Positivist worship, which means the noblest expression of human feeling in art—all these things are *not* possible in any exclusive and meagre synagogue whatever, and are very much retarded by the premature formation of synagogues.

I look, as I say always, to the leavening of opinion generally; to the attitude of mind with which the world around us confronts Positivism and understands, or feels interest in Positivism. And here, and not in the formation of new congregations, I find the grounds for unbounded hope. Within a very few years, and notably within the year just ended, there has been a striking change of tone in the way in which the thoughtful public looks at Positivism. It has entirely passed out of the stage of silence and contempt. It occupies a place in the public interest, not equal yet to its importance in the future; but far in excess, I fear, of anything which its living exponents can justify in the present. The thoughtful public and the religious spirits acknowledge in it a genuine religious force. Candid Christians see that it has much which calls out their sympathy. But apart from that, the period of misunderstanding and of ridicule is passed for Positivism for ever. Serious people are beginning now to say that there is nothing in Positivism so extravagant, nothing so mischievous as they used to think. Many of them are beginning to see that it bears witness to valuable truths which have been hitherto neglected. They are coming to feel that in certain central problems of the modern world, such as the possibility of preserving the religious sentiment, in defending the bases of spiritual and temporal authority; in explaining the science of history, in the institution of property, in the future relations of men and women, employers and employed, government and people, teachers and learners, in all of these, Positivism holds up a ray of steady light in the chaos of opinion. They are asking themselves, the truly conservative and truly religious natures, if, after all, society may not be destined to be regenerated in some such ideal lines as Positivism shadows forth:—

“Via prima salutis,  
Quod minimè roris, Graia pandetur ab urbe.”

Here, then, is the great gain of the past year. It has for some time been felt that we have hold of a profound religious truth; that

Positivism, as Mr. Mill says, does realise the essential conditions of religion. But we have now made it clear that we have hold of a profound philosophical truth as well; and a living and prolific social truth. The cool, instructed, practical intellect is now prepared to admit that it is quite a reasonable hope to look for the cultivation of a purely human duty towards our fellow beings and our race collectively as a solid basis of moral and practical life—nay, further, that so far as it goes, and without excluding other bases of life, this is a sound, and indeed, a very common, spring to right action. It is an immense step gained that the cool, instructed, practical intellect of our day goes with us up to this point. It is a minor matter, that in conceding so much, this same intelligent man-of-the-world is ready to say, "You must throw over, however, all the mummery and priestcraft with which Positivism began its career." Positivism has no mummery or priestcraft to throw over. The whole idea of such things arose out of laboured epigrams manufactured about the utopias of Comte when exaggerated into a formalism by some of his more excitable followers.

In the history of any great truth we generally find three stages of public opinion regarding it. The first, of unthinking hostility; the second, of minimising its novelty; the third, of adopting it as an obvious truism. Men say first, "Nothing more grotesque and mischievous was ever propounded!" Then they say, "Now that it has entirely changed its front, there is nothing to be afraid of, and not much that is new!" And in the third stage they say, "We have held this all our lives, and it is a mere commonplace of modern thought." Positivism has now passed out of the first stage. Men have ceased to think of it as grotesque or mischievous. They have now passed into the second stage, and say, "Now that it is showing itself as mere common-sense, it is little more than a re-statement of what reasonable men have long thought, and what good men have long aimed at." Quite so, only there has been no change of front, no abandoning of anything, and no modification, of any essential principle. We have only made it clear that the original prejudices we had to meet were founded in haste, misconception, and mere caricature. We have shown that Positivism is just as truly scientific as it is religious; that it has as much aversion to priestcraft, ritualism, and ceremony, as any Protestant sectary; and as deep an aversion to sects as the Pope of Rome or the President of the Royal Society. Positivism itself is as loyal to every genuine result of modern science as the Royal Society itself. The idea that any reasonable Positivist undervalues the real triumphs of science, or could dream of minimising any solid conclusion of science, or of limiting the progress of science, or would pit any unproven assertion of any man, be he Comte, or an entire Ecumenical Council of Comtists, so to speak,

against any single proven conclusion of human research, this, I say, is too laughable to be seriously imputed to any Positivist.

If Auguste Comte had ever used language which could fairly be so understood, I will not stop to inquire. I do not believe he has. But if I were shown fifty such passages, they would not weigh with me a grain against the entire basis and genius of Positivism itself; which is that human life shall henceforward be based on a footing of solid demonstration alone. If enthusiastic Positivists, more Comtist than Comte, ever gave countenance to such an extravagance, I can only say that they no more represent Positivism than General Booth's brass band represents Christianity. If words of Auguste Comte have been understood to mean that the religion of Humanity can be summed up in the repetition of phrases, or can be summed up in anything less than a moral and scientific education of man's complex nature, I can only treat it as a caricature unworthy of notice. This hall is the centre in this country where the Positivist scheme is presented in its entirety, under the immediate direction of Comte's successor. And speaking in his name and in the name of our English committee, I claim it as an essential purpose of our existence as an organized body, to promote a sound scientific education, so as to abolish the barrier which now separates school and Church; to cultivate individual training in all true knowledge, and the assertion of individual energy of character and brain; to promote independence quite as much as association; personal responsibility, quite as much as social discipline; and free public opinion, in all things spiritual and material alike, quite as much as organised guidance by trained leaders. Whatever makes light of these, whatever is indifferent to scientific education, whatever tends to blind and slavish surrender of the judgment and the will, whatever clings to mysticism, formalism, and priestcraft, such belongs not to Positivism, to Auguste Comte, or to humanity rightly regarded and honoured. The first condition of the religion of Humanity is human nature and common sense.

Whilst Positivism has been making good its ground within the area of scientific philosophy, scientific metaphysics has been exhibiting the signal weakness of its position on the side of religion. To those who have once entered into the scientific world of belief in positive knowledge there is no choice between a belief in nothing at all and a belief in the future of human civilisation, between Agnosticism and Humanity. Agnosticism is therefore for the present the rival and antagonist of Positivism outside the orthodox fold. I say for the present, because by the nature of the case Agnosticism is a mere raft or jury-mast for shipwrecked believers, a halting-place, and temporary passage from one belief to another belief. The idea that the deepest issues of life and of thought can be permanently referred to any negation; that cultivated beings can feel proud of summing up their

religious belief in the formula, that they "know nothing," this is too absurd to endure. Agnosticism is a milder form of the Voltairean hatred of religion that was current in the last century; but it is quite as passing a phase. For the moment, it is the fashion of the emancipated Christian to save all trouble by professing himself an Agnostic. But he is more or less ashamed of it. He knows it is a subterfuge. It is no real answer. It is only an excuse for refusing to answer a troublesome question. The Agnostic knows that he will have to give a better answer some day; he finds earnest men clamouring for an answer. He is getting uneasy that they will not take "Don't know" for an answer. He is himself too full still of theology and metaphysics to follow our practice, which is to leave the theological conundrum alone, and to proclaim *regard for the human race as an adequate solution of the human problem*. And in the meantime he staves off questions by making his own ignorance—his own ignorance!—the foundation of a creed.

We have just seen the failure of one of these attempts. The void caused by the silent crumbling of all the spiritual creeds has to be filled in some way. The indomitable passion of mankind towards an object to revere and work for, has to be met. And the latest device has been, as we have seen, to erect the "Unknowable" itself into the sole reality, and to assure us that an indescribable heap of abstract terms is the true foundation of life. So that, after all its protestations against any superstitious belief, Agnosticism floats back into a cloud of contradictions and negations as unthinkable as those of the Athanasian creed, and which are merely our old theological attributes again, dressed up in the language of Esoteric Buddhism.

## II.

I turn now, as is our custom, to review the work of the year under its threefold heads of Cult, Education, Politics. You will see that I avoid the word Worship, because worship is so often misunderstood; and because it wholly fails to convey the meaning of the Positivist *cultus*, or stimulus of the noblest emotions of man. Worship is in no way a translation of Comte's word *culte*. In French we can talk of the *culte des mères*, or the *culte des morts*, or the *culte des enfants*, or the *culte de l'Art*. We cannot in English talk of *worshipping* our mothers, or *worshipping* our dead friends, or *worshipping* children, or *worshipping* art; or, if we use the words, we do not mean the same thing. Comte has suffered deeply by being crudely translated into English phrases, by people who did not see that the same phrase in English means something different. Now his *culte de l'Humanité* does not mean what Englishmen understand by the worship of Humanity: *i.e.*, they are apt to fancy, kneeling down and praying to Humanity, or sing-

ing a hymn to Humanity. By *culte de l'Humanité* is meant, deepening our sense of gratitude and regard for the human race and its living or dead organs. And everything which does this is *cult*, though it may not be what we call in English worship. So *service* is a word I avoid; because the service of Humanity consists in the thousand ways in which we fulfil our social duties, and not in uttering exclamations which may or may not lead to anything in conduct, and which we have no reason to suppose are heard by any one, or affect any one outside the room where they are uttered. The commemoration of a great man such as William the Silent or Corneille is *cult*, though we do not worship him; the solemn delight in a piece of music in such a spirit is *cult*, though it is not *worship*, or *service*, in the modern English sense of these words. The ceremony of interring a dead friend, or naming a child is *cult*, though we do not worship our dead friend, nor do we worship the baby when brought for presentation. Cult, as we understand it, is a process that concerns the person or persons who worship, not the being worshipped. Whatever stimulates the sense of social duty and kindles the noblest emotions, whether by a mere historical lecture, or a grand piece of music, or by a solemn act, or by some expression of emotion—this is cult.

In the same way, I avoid the word *religion*, to signify any special department or any one side of our Positivist life. Religion is not a part of life, but a harmonious and true living of our lives; not the mere expression of feeling, but the right convergence of feeling and thought into pure action. Some of our people seem to use the word "religion," in the theological sense, to mean the formal expression of a sentiment of devotion. This is a mere distortion of Comte's language, and essentially unworthy of the broad spirit of Positivism. The full meaning of *culte*, as Comte employed it, is every act by which man expresses and every means by which he kindles the sense of reverence, duty, love, or resignation. In that sense, and in that sense only, do I now employ *cult*, which is obviously a somewhat inadequate English phrase.

The past year opened with the commemoration of this day, in which, though the words of praise and devotion that we uttered were few, we sought to brace our spirits and clear our brains by pausing for an hour in the midst of the whirl of life, to look forth on the vast range of our social duties and the littleness of our individual performance. On the 5th of September, the twenty-seventh anniversary of the death of Auguste Comte, we met, as usual, to commemorate his life and work. The discourse then given will be shortly published. At the friendly repast and in the social meeting of that day we had the welcome presence of several members of our Positivist body in Paris and also from the northern cities of England. The hundredth year since the death of Diderot, the two hundredth since

that of Corneille, the three hundredth since that of the great founder of the Netherlands, William of Orange, called the Silent, were duly commemorated by a discourse on their life and work. Such vague and unreal ideas are suggested by the phrase, the *worship of humanity*, that it is useful to point out that this is what we in this hall mean by such a notion: the strengthening our sense of respect for the worthy men in the past by whom civilisation has been built up. This is what we mean by the worship of humanity. A mere historical lecture, if its aim and its effect be to kindle in us enthusiastic regard for the noble men who have gone before us, and by whose lives and deaths we are what we are,—this is the worship of humanity, and not the utterance of invocations to an abstract idea.

On the 28th of last month we held a commemoration of the great musician, Beethoven, in all respects like that which we had given two years ago for Mozart. Our friend Professor Henry Holmes and his admirable quartett again performed two of those immortal pieces, and our friend, Mr. Vernon Lushington, again gave us one of those beautiful discourses on the glorious art to which he and his have devoted so much of their lives. These occasions, which are a real creation of Positivism, I deeply enjoy. They are neither concert nor lecture, nor service specially, but all three together, and much more. It is the one mode in which at present the religion of the future can put forth its yearnings for a sacred art worthy to compare with the highest types of Christian art. We meet not to listen to a musical display—not to hear the history of the musician's life—not to commemorate his career by any formal ceremony; but we mingle with our words of gratitude, and honour and affection for the artist, the worthy rehearsing of his consummate ideas in a spirit of devotion for him and the glorious company of whom he is one of the most splendid chiefs.

Last night, as the year closed, we met as before to dwell on the past, on the departing year that was being laid to rest in the incalculable catacombs of time, and on the infinite myriads of human beings by whom those catacombs are peopled; and with music and with voice we sought to attune our spirits to the true meanings of the hour. The year has been to many of us one of cruel anxieties, of sad memories and irreparable loss. In Mr. Cutler we have lost a most sincere and valued brother. As we stood round his open grave, there was but one feeling in our gathered mourners—a sense of loss that could ill be borne, honour to his gentle and upright career, sympathy with those whom he had left. The occasion will long be remembered, perhaps, as the first on which our body has ever been called on to take part in a purely Positivist burial service. Did any one present feel that the religion of Humanity is without its power to dignify, to consecrate, and to console in the presence of death? I

speak not for others, but for myself. And, for my part, when I remember the pathetic chant of our friends at the grave, the reality of their reverent sorrow, the consolatory sense of resignation and hope with which we laid our brother in his peaceful bed, I feel the conviction that in this supreme office, the great test of religious power, the faith in Humanity will surpass the faith in the fictions—in beauty, in pathos, in courage, and in consolation, even as it so manifestly surpasses them in reality.

The hand of death has been heavy on us both abroad and at home. The past year has carried off to their immortal life two of the original disciples and friends of our master, Auguste Hadery and Fabien Magnin. Both have been most amply honoured in funeral sermons by M. Laffitte. Fabien Magnin was one of those rare men who represent to the present the type that we look for in the future. A workman (he was an engine-pattern maker), he chose to live and die a workman, proud of his order, and confident in its destinies; all through his long life without fortune, or luxury, or ambition; a highly-trained man of science; a thoroughly-trained politician, loyal unshakenly to his great teacher and his successor; of all the men I have ever known the most perfect type of the cultivated, incorruptible, simple, courageous man of the people. With his personal influence over his fellow-workmen, and from the ascendancy of his intellect and character, he might easily in France have forced his way into the foremost place. With his scientific resources, and his faculty both for writing and speech, he might easily have entered the literary or scientific class. With his energy, prudence, and mechanical skill, he might easily have amassed a fortune. The attractions of such careers never seemed to touch by a ripple the serene surface of his austere purity. He chose to live and die in the strictest simplicity—the type of an honest and educated citizen, who served to make us feel all that the future has to promise to the workman, when remaining a workman, devoted to his craft and to his order, he shall be as highly educated as the best of us to-day; as courteous and dignified as the most refined; as simple as the ideal village pastor; as ardent a Republican as the Ferrys and Gambettas whose names fill the journals.

We have this past year also carried out another series of commemorations, long familiar to our friends in France, but which are a real creation of Positivist belief. I mean those Pilgrimages or religious visits to the scenes of the lives of our great men. This is a real revival of a noble mediæval and Oriental practice, but wholly without superstitious taint, and entirely in the current of modern scientific thought. We go in a body to some spot where one of our immortal countrymen lived or died, and there, full of the beauty of the scene on which he used to gaze, and of the *genius loci* by which he was inspired, we listen to a simple discourse on his life and work. In this



way we visited the homes or the graves of Bacon, of Harvey, of Milton, of Penn, of Cromwell, and of our William of Orange. What may not the art of the future produce for us in this most fruitful mode, when in place of the idle picnics and holidays of vacant sightseers, in place of the formal celebration of some prayer-book saint, we shall gather in a spirit of real religion and honour round the birthplace, the home, it may be the grave, of some poet, thinker, or ruler; and amidst all the inspiration of Nature and of the sacred memories of the soil, shall fill our hearts with the joy in beauty and profound veneration of the mighty Dead?

### III.

In our Sunday meetings, which have been regularly continued excepting during the four summer months, we have continued our plan of dealing alike with the religious, the social, and the intellectual sides of the Positivist view of life and duty. The Housing of the Poor, Art, Biology, Socialism, our Social Duties, the Memory of the Dead, the Positivist grounds of Morality, and our Practical Duties in Life, formed the subject of one series. Since our re-opening in the autumn, we have had courses on the Bible, on the religious value of the modern poets, and on the true basis of social equality. Amongst the features of special interest in these series of discourses is that one course was given by a former Unitarian minister who, after a life of successful preaching in the least dogmatic of all the Christian Churches, has been slowly reduced to the conviction that the reality of Humanity is a more substantial basis for religion to rest on than the hypothesis of God, and that the great scheme of human morality is a nobler Gospel to preach than the artificial ideal of a subjective Christ. I would in particular note the series of admirable lectures on the Bible, by Dr. Bridges, which combined the results of the latest learning on this intricate mass of ancient writings with the sympathetic and yet impartial judgment with which Positivists adopt into their sacred literature the most famous and most familiar of all the religious books of mankind. And again I would note that beautiful series of discourses by Mr. Vernon Lushington on the great religious poets of the modern world:—Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron, Wordsworth and Shelley. When we have them side by side, we shall have before us a new measure of the sound, sympathetic, and universal spirit of Positivist belief. It is only those who are strangers to it and to us who can wonder how we come to put the Bible and the poets in equal places of honour as alike the great organs of true religious feeling.

The systematic teaching of science, which is an essential part of our conception of Positivism, has been maintained in this hall with unabated energy. In the beginning of the year Mr. Vernon Lushington commenced and carried through (with what an effort of

personal self-devotion no one of us can duly measure) his class on the history and the elements of Astronomy. This winter, Mr. Lock has opened a similar class on the History and Elements of Mathematics. Positivism is essentially a scheme for reforming education, and it is only through a reformed education, universal to all classes alike, and concerned with the heart as much as the intellect, that the religious meaning of Humanity can ever be unfolded. The singing class, the expense of which was again assumed by Mr. Lushington, was steadily and successfully maintained during the first part of the year. We are still looking forward to the formation of a choir. The social meetings which we instituted last year have become a regular feature of our movement, and greatly contribute to our closer union and our better understanding of the social and sympathetic meaning of the faith we profess.

The publications of the year have been first and chiefly, *The Testament and Letters of Auguste Comte*, a work long looked for, the publication of which has been long delayed by various causes. In the next place I would call attention to the new and popular edition of *International Policy*, a work of combined essays which we put forward in 1866, nearly twenty years ago. Our object in that work was to state and apply to the leading international problems in turn the great principles of social morality on which it is the mission of Positivism to show that the politics of nations can only securely repose. In an epoch which is still tending, we are daily assured, to the old passion for national self-assertion, it is significant that the Positivist school alone can resolutely maintain and fearlessly repeat its dictates of morality and justice, whilst all the Churches, all the political parties, and all the so-called organs of opinion, which are really the creatures of parties and cliques, find various pretexts for abandoning them altogether. How few are the political schools around us who could venture to republish after twenty years, *their* political programmes of 1866, *their* political doctrines and practical solutions of the tangled international problems, and who could not find in 1885 a principle which they had discarded, or a proposal which to-day they are ashamed to have made twenty years ago.

Beside these books, the only separate publications of our body are the affecting address of Mr. Ellis *On the due Commemoration of the Dead*. The Positivist Society has met throughout the year for the discussion of the social and political questions of the day. The most public manifestation of its activity has been the part that it took in the third centenary of the great hero of national independence, William, Prince of Orange, called the Silent. The noble and weighty address in which Mr. Beesly expressed to the Dutch committee at Delft the honour in which we held that immortal memory, has deeply touched, we are told, those to whom it was addressed. And it is sig-

nificant that from this hall, dedicated to peace, to the Republic, to the people, and to Humanity, there was sent forth the one voice from the entire British race in honour to the great prince, the soldier, the diplomatist, the secret, subtle, and haughty chief who, three hundred years ago, created the Dutch nation. We have learned here to care little for a purely insular patriotism. The great creators of nations are *our* forefathers and *our* countrymen. Protestant or Catholic are *nothing* to us, so long as either prepared the way for a broader faith. In our abhorrence of war we have learned to honour the chief who fought desperately for the solid bases of peace. In our zeal for the people, for public opinion, for simplicity of life, and for truthfulness and openness in word as in conduct, we have not forgotten the *relative* duty of those who in darker, fiercer, ruder times than ours used the weapons of their age in the spirit of duty, and to the saving of those precious elements wherewith the future of a better Humanity shall be formed.

## IV.

Turning to the political field, I shall occupy but little of your time with the special questions of the year. We are as a body entirely dissevered from party politics. We seek to colour political activity with certain moral general principles, but we have no interest in party politics as such. The idea that Positivists are, as a body, Radicals or Revolutionaries is an idle invention; and I am the more entitled to repudiate it, in that I have myself formally declined to enter on a Parliamentary career, on the express ground that I prefer to judge political questions without the trammels of any party obligation. On the one hand we are Republicans on principle, in that we demand a government in the interest of all and of no favoured order, by the highest available capacity, without reference to birth, or wealth, or class. On the other hand, we are not Democrats, in that we acknowledge no abstract right to govern in a numerical majority. Whatever is best administered is best. We desire to see efficiency for the common welfare, responsible power intrusted to the most capable hand, with continuous responsibility to a real public opinion.

I am far from pretending that general principles of this kind entitle us to pass a judgment on the complex questions of current politics, or that all Positivists who recognise these principles are bound to judge current politics in precisely the same way. There is in Positivism a deep vein of true Conservatism; as there is also an unquenchable yearning for a social revolution of a just and peaceful kind. But no one, of these tendencies impel us, I think, to march under the banner either of Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury. As Republicans on principle, we desire the end of all hereditary institutions. As believers in public opinion, we desire to see opinion represented in the most complete way, and without class distinctions. As

men who favour efficiency and concentration in government, we support whatever may promise to relieve us of the scandalous deadlock to which Parliamentary government has long been reduced. It may be permitted to those who are wholly detached from party interests to express a lively satisfaction that the long electoral struggle is happily got out of the way, and that a great stride has been taken towards a government at once energetic and popular, without regarding the hobbies about the representation of women and the representation of inorganic minorities.

It is on a far wider field that our great political interests are absorbed. There is everywhere a revival of the spirit of national aggrandisement and imperial ambition. Under the now avowed lead of the great German dictator, the nations of Europe are running a race to extend their borders by conquest and annexation amongst the weak and uncivilised. There is to-day a scramble for Africa, as there was formerly a scramble for Asia; and the scramble in Asia, or in Polynesia, is only less urgent for the moment, in that the rivalry is just now keenest in Africa. But in Asia, in Africa, in Polynesia, the strong nations of Europe are struggling to found empires by violence, fraud, or aggression. Three distinct wars are being waged in the East; and in Africa alone our soldiers and our Government are asserting the rule of the sword in the North, on the East, in the centre, on the South, and on the West at the same time. Five years ago, we were told that for England at least there was to be some lull in this career of blood and ambition. It was only, we see, a party cry, a device to upset a government. There has been no lull, no pause in the scramble for empire. The empire swells year by year; year by year fresh wars break out; year by year the burden of empire increases whether Disraeli or Gladstone, Liberal or Conservative, are the actual wielders of power. The agents of the aggression, the critics, have changed sides; the Jingoës of yesterday are the grumblers of to-day; and the peaceful patriots of yesterday are the Jingoës of to-day. The empire and its appendages are even vaster in 1885 than in 1880; its responsibilities are greater; its risks and perplexities deeper; its enemies stronger and more threatening. And in the midst of this crisis, those who condemn this policy are fewer; their protests come few and faint. The Christian sects can see nothing unrighteous in Mr. Gladstone; the Liberal caucuses stifle any murmur of discontent, and force those who spoke out against Zulu, Afghan, and Trans-Vaal wars to justify, by the tyrant's plea of necessity, the massacre of Egyptian fellahs and the extermination of Arab patriots. They who mouthed most loudly about Jingoism are now the foremost in their appeals to national vanity. And the parasites of the parasites of our great Liberal statesman can make such hubbub, in his utter absence of a policy, that they drive him by sheer

clamour from one adventure into another. For nearly four years now we have continuously protested against the policy pursued in Egypt. Year after year we have told Mr. Gladstone that it was blackening his whole career and covering our country with shame. There is a monotony about our protests. But, when there is a monotony in evil-doing, there must alike be monotony in remonstrance. We complain that the blood and treasure of this nation should be used in order to flay the peasantry of the Nile, in the interest of usurers and speculators. We complain that we practically annex a people whom we will not govern and cannot benefit. We are boldly for what in the slang of the day is called "scuttling" out of Egypt. We think the robber and the oppressor should scuttle as quickly as possible, that he is certain to scuttle some day. We complain of massacring an innocent people merely to give our traders and money-dealers larger or safer markets. We complain of all the campaigns and battles as wanton, useless, and unjust massacres. We especially condemn the war in the Soudan as wanton and unjust even in the avowal of the very ministers who are urging it. The defender of Khartoum is a man of heroic qualities and beautiful nature; but the cause of civilisation is not served by launching amongst savages a sort of Pentateuch knight errant. And we seriously complain that the policy of a great country in a great issue of right and wrong should be determined by school-boy shouting over the feats of our English Garibaldi.

It is true that our Ministers, and especially Mr. Gladstone, Lord Granville, and Lord Derby, are the public men who are now most conspicuously resisting the forward policy, and that the outcry of the hour is against them on that ground. But ambition should be made of sterner stuff. Those who aspire to guide nations should meet the folly of the day with more vigorous assertion of principle. And the men who are waging a wanton, bloody, and costly war in the sands of Africa have no principle left to assert.

It may well be that Mr. Gladstone, and most of those who follow him in office, are of all our public men those who have least liking for these wars, annexations, and oppressive dealings with the weak. They may have less liking for them it may be, but they are the men who do these things. They are responsible. The blood lies on their doorstep. The guilt hangs on their fame. The corruption of the national conscience is their doing. The page of history will write their names and their deeds in letters of gore and of flame. It is mockery, even in the most servile parliamentary drudge, to repeat to us that the wrong lies at the door of the Opposition, foreign intriguers, international engagements, untoward circumstances. Keep these threadbare pretexts to defend the next official blunder amidst the cheers of a party mob. The English people will have none of such stale equivocation. The Ministers who massacred thousands at Tel-

el-Kebir, at Alexandria, at Fez, at Tamasi, who are sinking millions of our people's hard-won savings in the sands of Africa, in order to slaughter a brave race whom they themselves declare to be heroes and patriots fighting for freedom; and who after three years of this bloodshed, ruin, and waste, have nothing to show for it—nothing, except the utter chaos of a fine country, the extreme misery of an innocent people, and all Europe glowering at us in menace and hate—the men who have done this are responsible. When they fail to annex some trumpery bit of coast, the failure is naturally set down to blundering, not to conscience. History, their country, their own conscience will make them answer for it. The headlong plunge of our State, already over-burdened with the needs and the dangers of a heterogeneous empire, the consuming rage for national extension, which the passion for money, markets, careers, breeds in a people where moral and religious principles are loosened and conflicting, this is the great evil of our time. It is to stem this that statesmen should address themselves. It is to fan this, or to do its bidding, that our actual statesmen contend. Mr. Gladstone in his heart may loathe the task to which he is set and the uses to which he lends his splendid powers. But there are some situations where weakness before powerful clamour works national ruin more readily even than ambition itself. How petty to our descendants will our squabbles in the parliamentary game appear, when history shall tell them that Gladstone waged far more wars than Disraeli; that he slaughtered more hecatombs of innocent people; that he oppressed more nations, embroiled us worse with foreign nations; left the empire of a far more unwieldy size, more exposed and on more rotten foundations; and that Mr. Gladstone did all this not because it seemed to him wise or just, but for the same reason (in truth) that his great rival acted, viz., that it gave him unquestioned ascendancy in his party and with those whose opinion he sought.

I have not hesitated to speak out my mind of the policy condemned, not in personal hostility or in irritation, however much I respect the great qualities of Mr. Gladstone himself, however little I desire to see him displaced by his rivals. No one will venture to believe that I speak in the interest of party, or have any quarrel with my own countrymen. All that I have said in condemnation of the African policy of England I would say in condemnation of the Chinese policy in France. I would say it all the more because, for reasons on which I will not now enlarge, our brethren in France have said so little, and that little with so broken a voice. It is a weakness to our common cause that so little has been said in France. But I rejoice to see that in the new number of our Review, our director, M. Laffitte, has spoken emphatically against all disturbance of the *status quo*, and the policy of founding colonial empires. It behoves us all the more to

speak out plainly here. There is much the same situation in France as in England. A Ministry whom the majority trust, and whom the military and trading class can bend to do their will; a thirst in the rich to extend the empire; a thirst in the adventurers for careers to be won; a thirst in the journalists for material wherewith to pamper the national vanity. There, too, are in the East backward peoples to be trampled on, a confused tangle of pretexts and opportunities, a Parliamentary majority to be secured, and a crowd of interests to be bribed. In the case of M. Ferry, we can see all the weakness, all the helpless vacillations, all the danger of his game; its cynical injustice, its laughable pretexts and excuses, its deliberate violation of the real interests of the nation, the formidable risks that he is preparing for his country, and the ruin which is as certain to follow it. In Mr. Gladstone's case there are national and party salves for the conscience of the boldest critic.

The year, too, has witnessed a new form of the spread-eagle tendency in the revival of one of our periodical scares about the strength of the navy. About once in every ten or twenty years a knot of shipbuilders, journalists, seamen, and gunners contrive to stir up a panic, and to force the nation into a great increase of its military expenditure. I am not going to discuss the truth about the Navy, or whether it be equal or not to the requirements of the Service. I look at this in a new way: I take up very different ground. I say that the service, to which we are now called on to make the navy equal, is a service that we ought not to undertake. The requirements demanded are wholly incompatible with the true interests of our nation. They are opposed to the real conditions of civilisation. They will be in a very few years, even if they are not now, beyond the power of this people to meet. The claim to a maritime supremacy, in the sense that this country is permanently to remain undisputed mistress of all seas, always able and ready to overwhelm any possible combination of any foreign Powers, this claim in itself is a ridiculous anachronism. Whether the British fleet is now able to overpower the combined fleets of Europe, or even of several Powers in Europe, I do not know. Even if it be now able, such is the progress of events, the ambition of our neighbours, and the actual conditions of modern war, that it is physically impossible that such a supremacy can be permanently maintained. To maintain it, even for another generation, would involve the subjection of England to a military tyranny such as exists for the moment in Germany, to a crushing taxation and conscription, of which we have had no experience. We should have to spend, not twenty-five, but fifty millions a year on our army and navy if we intend to be really masters in every sea, and to make the entire British Empire one continuous Malta and Gibraltar. And even that, or a hundred millions a year, would not suffice in the future

for the inevitable growth of foreign powers and the constant growth of our own empire. To guarantee the permanent supremacy of the seas, we shall need some Bismarck to crush our free people into the vice of his military autocracy and universal conscription.

"Rule Britannia," or England's exclusive dominion of the seas, is a temporary (in my opinion, an unfortunate) episode in our history. To brag about it and fight for it is the part of a bad citizen; to maintain it would be a crime against the human race. To have founded, not an empire, but a scattered congeries of possessions in all parts of the world by conquest, intrigue, or arbitrary seizure, is a blot upon our history; to perpetuate it is a burdensome inheritance to bequeath to our children. To ask that this inorganic heap of possessions shall be perpetually extended, made absolutely secure against all comers, and guarded by a fleet which is always ready to meet the world in arms—this is a programme which it is the duty of every good citizen to stamp out. Whilst this savage policy is in vogue, the very conditions of national morality, of peace, of true industrial civilisation are wanting. The first condition of healthy national progress is to have broken for ever with this national buccaneering. The commerce, the property of Englishmen on the seas must protect itself, like that of other nations, by just, prudent, and civilised bearing, and not by an exclusive dominion which other great nations do very well without. The commerce and the honour of Americans are safe all over the world, though their navy is not one-tenth of ours. And Germany can speak with us face to face on every ocean, though she can hardly put a first-rate ship in array of battle. To talk big about refusing to trust the greatness of England to the sufferance of her neighbours is mere clap-trap. It is the phrase of Mexican or Californian desperadoes when they fill their pockets with revolvers and bowie-knives. All but two or three of the greatest nations are obliged, at all times, to trust their existence to the sufferance of their stronger neighbours. And they are just as safe, and quite as proud, and more civilised than their great neighbours in consequence. Human society, whether national or international, only begins when social morality has taken the place of individual violence. Society, for men or nations, cannot be based on the revolver and bowie-knife principle.

We repudiate, then, with our whole souls the code of buccaneer patriotism. True statesmen are bound to check, not to promote, the expansion of England; to provide for the peaceful disintegration of the heterogeneous empire, the permanence of which is as incapable of being justified in policy as of being materially defended in arms. These aggressions and annexations and protectorates, these wanton wars amongst savages are at once blunders and crimes, pouring out by millions what good government and thrift at home save by thousands, degrading the present generation and deeply wronging the



next. We want no fleet greater than that of our greatest neighbours, and the claim to absolute dominion at sea must be put away like the claim to the kingdom of France or exclusive right to the British Channel. We can afford to smile at the charge that we are degenerate Britons or wanting in patriotism. Patriotism to us is a deep and working desire for the good name of England, for the justice and goodness of her policy, for the real enlightenment and well-being of her sons, and for her front place in humanity and civilisation. We smile at the vapouring of men to whom patriotism means a good cry, and several extra editions.

It may seem for the moment that doctrines such as ours are out of credit, and that there is little hope of their ever obtaining the mastery. We are told that to-day not a voice is raised to oppose the doctrines of spoliation. It is true that, owing to the hubbub of party politics, to the servility of the Christian Churches, and the low morality of the press, these national acts of rapacity have passed as yet with but small challenge. But at any rate here our voice has never wavered, nor have considerations of men, parties, or majorities led us to temporise with our principles. We speak out plainly—not more plainly than Mr. Gladstone and his followers on platform and in press spoke out once—and we shall go on to speak out plainly, whether we are many or whether we are few, whether the opinion of the hour is with us or not. But I am not despondent. Nor do I doubt the speedy triumph of our stronger morality. I see with what weather-cock rapidity the noisiest of the Anti-Jingoes can change their tone. The tribe of Cleon and the Sausage-seller are the same in every age. I will not believe that the policy of a great nation can be long dictated by firms of advertising touts, who will puff the new soap, a comic singer, and an imperial war in the same page; who are equally at home in the partition of Africa or a penny dreadful. Nations are not seriously led by the arts which make village bumpkins crowd to the show of the fat girl and the woolly pig. In the rapid degradation of the press to the lower American standard we may see an escape from its mischief. The age is one of democracy. We have just taken a great stride towards universal suffrage and the government of the people. In really republican societies, where power rests on universal suffrage, as in France, and in America, the power of the press is reduced to a very low ebb. The power of journalism is essentially one of town life and small balanced parties. Its influence evaporates where power is held by the millions, and government appeals directly to vast masses of voters spread over immense areas. Cleon and the Sausage-seller can do little when republican institutions are firmly rooted over the length and breadth of a great country.

The destinies of this nation have now been finally committed to the people, and to the people we will appeal with confidence. The

labourer and the workman have no interest in these warlike wars, in this imperial expansion, in this rivalry of traders and brag of arms; no taste for it and no respect for it. They find that they are dragged off to die in wars of which they know nothing; that their wages are taxed to support adventures which they loathe. The people are by instinct opponents of these crimes, and to them we will appeal. The people have a natural sense of justice and a natural leaning to public morality. Ambition, lucre, restlessness, and vain-glory do not corrupt their minds to approve a financial adventure. They need peace, productive industry, humanity. Every step towards the true republic is a step towards morality. To the new voters, to the masses of the people, we will confidently appeal.

There is, too, another side to this matter. If these burdens are to be thrust on the national purse, and (should the buccaneers have their way) if the permanent war expenditure must be doubled, and little wars at ten and twenty millions each are inevitable as well, then in all fairness the classes who make these wars and profit by them must pay for them. We have taken a great stride towards democracy, and two of the first taxes with which the new democracy will deal are the income-tax and the land-tax. The entire revision of taxation is growing inevitable. It is a just and sound principle that the main burden of taxation shall be thrown on the rich, and we have yet to see how the new democracy will work out that just principle. A graduated income-tax is a certain result of the movement. The steady pressure against customs duties and the steady decline in habits of drinking must combine to force the taxation of the future more and more on income and on land. A rapid rise in the scale of taxing incomes, until we reach the point where great fortunes cease to be rapidly accumulated, would check the wasteful expenditure on war more than any consideration of justice. Even a China merchant would hardly promote an opium war when he found himself taxed ten or twenty per cent. on his income.

One of the first things which will occur to the new rural voters is the ridiculous minimum to which the land-tax is reduced. Mr. Henry George and the school of land reformers have lately been insisting that the land-tax must be immensely increased. At present it is a farce, not one-tenth of what is usual in the nations of Europe. I entirely agree with them, and am perfectly prepared to see the land-tax raised till it ultimately brings us some ten or even twenty millions, instead of one million. If the result would be to force a great portion of the soil to change hands, and to pass from the rent-receivers to the occupiers, all the more desirable. But one inevitable result of the new Reform Act must be a great raising of the taxes on land, and when land pays one-fifth of the total taxation, our wars will be fewer and our armaments more modest.

One of the cardinal facts of our immediate generation is the sudden revival of Socialism and Communism. It was not crushed, as we thought, in 1848; it was not extinguished in 1871. 'The new Republic in France is uneasy with it. The military autocracy of Germany is honeycombed with it. Society is almost dissolved by it in Russia. It is rife in America, in Italy, in Denmark, in Austria. Let no man delude himself that Socialism has no footing here. I tell them (and I venture to say that I know) Socialism within the last few years has made some progress here. It will assuredly make progress still. With the aspirations and social aims of Socialism we have much in common, little as we are Communists and firmly as we support the institution of private property. But if Socialism is in the ascendant, if the new democracy is exceedingly likely to pass through a wave of Socialist tendency, are these the men, and is this the epoch to foster a policy of imperial aggression? With the antipathy felt by Socialists for all forms of national selfishness, with their hatred of war, and their noble aspirations after the brotherhood of races and nations, we as Positivists are wholly at one. Let us join hands, then, with Socialists, with Democrats, with Humanitarians, and reformers of every school, who repudiate a policy of national oppression; and together let us appeal to the new democracy from the old plutocracy to arrest our nation in its career of blood, and to lift this guilty burden from the conscience of our children for ever.

So let us begin the year resolved to do our duty as citizens, fearlessly and honestly, striving to show our neighbours that social morality is a real religion in itself, by which men can order their lives and purify their hearts. Let us seek to be gentler as fathers, husbands, comrades, or masters; more dutiful as sons and daughters, learners, or helpers; more diligent as workers, students, or teachers; more loving and self-denying as men and as women everywhere. Let us think less about calling on Humanity and more about being humane. Let us talk less about religion, and try more fully to live religion. We have sufficiently explained our principles in words. Let us manifest them in act. I do not know that more is to be gained by the further preaching of our creed—much less by external profession of our own conviction. The world will be ours, the day that men see that Positivism in fact enables men to live a more pure and social life, that it fills us with a desire for all-useful knowledge, stimulates us to help one another and bear with one another, makes our homes the brighter, our children the better, our lives the nobler by its presence; and that on the foundation of order, and in the spirit of love, and with progress before us as our aim, we can live for others, live openly before all men. . . .

FREDERIC HARRISON.

## THE AMERICAN AUDIENCE.

WHAT is the difference between an English and an American audience? That is a question which has frequently been put to me, and which I have always found it difficult to answer. The points of dissimilarity are simply those arising from people of a common origin living under conditions often widely different. It is, therefore, only possible for me to indicate such traits in the bearing of the American playgoer as have come under my own personal notice, and impressed me with a sense of unfamiliarity.

Every American town, great or small, has—I believe, without exception—its theatre and its church, and when a new town is about to be built, the sites for a place of amusement and a place of worship are invariably those first selected. As an instance, take Pullman, which lies some sixteen miles from Chicago, pleasantly situated on the banks of the Calumet Lake. The original design of this little city, which is almost ideal in its organization, and has the enviable reputation of being absolutely perfect in its sanitation, was conceived on the lines just mentioned. Denver City, which is a growth almost abnormal even in an age and country of abnormal progress, has a theatre, which is said to be one of the finest in America. Boston, with its old civilisation, boasts seventeen theatres, or buildings in which plays are given; New York possesses no less than twenty-eight regular theatres, besides a host of smaller ones; and Chicago, whose very foundations are younger than the beards of some men of thirty, has, according to a printed list, over twenty theatres, all of which seem to flourish. The number of theatres in America and the influence they exercise constitute important elements in the national life. This great multiplication of dramatic possibilities renders it necessary to take a very wide and general view, if one wishes to get a distinct impression as to how audiences here differ from those at home. So at least it must seem to a player, who can only find comparison possible when points of difference suggest themselves. For a proper understanding of such difference in audiences, we must ascertain wherein consist the differences of the theatres which they frequent, both in architectural construction, social arrangement, and that habit of management which is a natural growth.

By the enactments of the various States regulating the structure and conduct of places of amusement, full provision for the comfort and safety of the audience is insisted on. It is directed that the back of the auditorium should open by adequate doors directly upon the main passage or vestibule, and that through the centre of the floor

should run ~~an~~ aisle right down to the orchestra rail. Thus the floor of the house is easy of access and exit, is generally of large expanse, and capable of containing half, or more than half, of the entire audience. It is usually divided into two parts—the orchestra or parquet, and the orchestra or parquet circle—the latter being a zone running around the former and covered by the projection of the first gallery. The floor of an American theatre is, as a rule, on a more inclined plane than is customary in English theatres, and there is a good view of the stage from every part. Outside the parquet circle, and within the inner wall of the building, is usually a wide passage where many persons can stand. Thus in most houses there is a great elasticity in the holding power, which at times adds not a little to the managerial success. I cannot but think that in several respects we have much to learn from our American cousins in the construction and arrangement of the auditorium of the theatre; on the other hand, they might study with advantage our equipment behind the proscenium.

It is perhaps due to the sentiment and tradition of personal equality in the nation, that the entire stream often turns to one portion of the house, in a way somewhat odd to those accustomed as we are in England to the separating force of social grades. To the great majority of persons, only one part of the theatre is eminently eligible, and other portions are mainly sought when the floor is occupied. The very willingness with which the public acquiesce in certain discomforts or annoyances attendant on visiting the theatre, would seem to show that the drama is an integral portion of their daily life. It cannot be denied by anyone cognizant of the working of American theatres that there are certain facts or customs which must discount enjoyment. Before a visitor is in a position to settle comfortably to the reception of a play, he must, as a rule, experience many inconveniences. In the first place he has in some States to submit to the exactions of the ticket speculator or "scalper," who, through defective State laws, is generally able to buy tickets in bulk, and to retail them at an exorbitant rate. I have known of instances where tickets of the full value of three dollars were paid for by the public at the average rate of ten or twelve dollars. Then, through the high price of labour, which in most American institutions causes employers to so dispose of their forces as to minimize service, the attendance in the front of the house is, I am told, often inadequate. Were it not for the orderly disposition and habit of the public, trained by the custom of equal rights to stand, and move *en queue*, it would not be possible to admit and seat the audience in the interval between the opening of the doors and the commencement of the performance. Thus the public are somewhat "hustled," and from one cause or another too

often reach their seats after having endured much annoyance with a patient submission which speaks volumes for their law-abiding nature; but which must sorely disturb that reposeful spirit which the actor may consider essential to a due enjoyment of the play.

Once in his seat the American playgoer does not, as a rule, leave it until the performance is at an end. The percentage of persons who move about during the *entr'acte* is, when compared with that in England, exceedingly small, and sinks into complete insignificance when contrasted with the exodus to the *foyer* customary in continental theatres. In the equipment of the American theatre there is one omission which will surprise us at home—that of the bar, or refreshment room. In not a single theatre that I can call to mind in America have I found provision made for drinking. It is not by any means that the average playgoer is a teetotaler, but that, if he wishes or needs to drink during the evening, he does it as he does during the hours of his working life, and not as a necessary concomitant to the enjoyment of his leisure hours. Two other things are noticeable: first, that the audiences are sometimes very unpunctual, and to suit the audiences the managers sometimes delay beginning. The audience depend on this delay, and the consequence frequently is, that a first act is entirely disturbed by their entry; secondly, that, after the play, it is a custom, in a degree unknown in any European capital, to adjourn to various restaurants for supper.

As the audience *en bloc* remain seated, so the length of the performance must be taken into account by managers; and commonly two hours and a half is considered the maximum length to which a performance should run, though I must say that we have at times sinned by keeping our audiences seated until eleven o'clock, and it has been even later. Of course in this branch of the subject must be also considered the difficulty of reaching their homes experienced by audiences in cities whose liberal arrangements of space, and absence of cheap cabs, renders necessary a due regard to time. In matter of duration, however, the audience is not to be trifled with or imposed on. I have heard of a case in a city of Colorado where the manager of a travelling company, on the last night of an engagement, in order to catch a through train, hurried the ordinary performance of his play into an hour and a half. When next the company were coming to the city they were met *en route*, some fifty miles out, by the sheriff, who warned them to pass on by some other way, as their coming was awaited by a large section of the able-bodied male population armed with shot guns. The company did not, I am informed, on that occasion visit the city. I may here mention that in America the dramatic season lasts about eight months—from the beginning of the "fall" in September till the hot weather commences

in April. During this period the theatres are kept busy, as there are performances on the evenings of every week day, and in the South and West on Sunday evening also, whilst matinées are given every Saturday, and in a larger number of cases every Wednesday. In certain places even the afternoon of Sunday sees a performance. It is a fact, somewhat amusing at first, that in nearly all towns of comparatively minor importance the theatre is known as the Opera House.

I have dwelt on the external condition of the American audiences in order to explain the condition antecedent to the actor's appearance. The differences between various audiences are so minute that some such insight seems necessary to enable one to recognise and understand them. An actor in the ordinary course of his work can only partially at best realise such differences as there may be, much less attempt to state them explicitly. His first experience before a strange audience is the discovery whether or not he is *en rapport* with them. This, however, he can most surely feel, though he cannot always give a reason for the feeling. As there is, in the occurrences of daily life, a conveyance other than by words of meaning, of sentiment, or of understanding between different individuals, so there is a carriage of mutual understanding or reciprocity of sentiment between the stage and the auditorium. The emotion which an actor may feel, or which his art may empower him successfully to simulate, can be conveyed over the floats in some way which neither actor nor audience may be able to explain; and the reciprocation of such emotion can be as surely manifested by the audience by more subtle and unconscious ways than overt applause or otherwise. It must be remembered that the opportunities which I have had of observing audiences have been almost entirely from my own stage. Little facility of wider observation is afforded to a man who plays seven performances each week and fills up most of the blank mornings with rehearsal or travel. I only put forward what I feel or believe. Such belief is based on the opportunities I have had of observation or of following out the experience of others.

The dominant characteristic of the American audience seems to be impartiality. They do not sit in judgment, resenting as positive offences lack of power to convey meanings or divergence of interpretation of particular character or scene. I understand that when they do not like a performance they simply go away, so that at the close of the evening the silence of a deserted house gives to the management a verdict more potent than audible condemnation. This does not apply to questions of morals, which can be, and are, as quickly judged here as elsewhere. On this subject I give entirely the evidence of others, for it has been my good fortune to see our audiences seated till the final falling of the curtain. Again, there

is a kindly feeling on the part of the audience towards the actor as an individual, especially if he be not a complete stranger, which is, I presume, a part of that recognition of individuality which is so striking a characteristic in American life and customs. Many an actor draws habitually a portion of his audience, not in consequence of artistic merit, not from capacity to arouse or excite emotion, but simply because there is something in his personality which they like. This spirit forcibly reminds me of the story told of the manager of one of the old "Circuits," who gave as a reason for the continued engagement of an impossibly bad actor, that "he was kind to his mother." The thorough enjoyment of the audience is another point to be noticed. Not only are they quick to understand and appreciate, but there seems to be a genuine pleasure in the expression of approval. American audiences are not surpassed in quickness and completeness of comprehension by any that I have yet seen, and no actor need fear to make his strongest or his most subtle effort, for such is sure to receive instant and full acknowledgment at their hands.

There is little more than this to be said of the American audience. But short though the record is, the impression upon the player himself is profound and abiding. To describe what one sees and hears over the footlights is infinitely easier than to convey an idea of the mental disposition and feeling of the spectators. The house is ample and comfortable, and the audience is well-disposed to be pleased. Ladies and gentlemen alike are mostly in morning dress, distinguished in appearance, and guided in every respect by a refined decorum. The sight is generally picturesque. Even in winter flowers abound, and the majority of ladies have bouquets either carried in the hand or fastened on the shoulder or corsage. At matinée performances especially, where the larger proportion of the audience is composed of ladies, the effect is not less pleasing to the olfactory senses than to the eye. Courteous, patient, enthusiastic, the American audience is worthy of any effort which the actor can make on its behalf, and he who has had experience of them would be an untrustworthy chronicler if he failed, or even hesitated, to bear witness to their intelligence, their taste, and their generosity.

HENRY IRVING.



## REPRESENTATION AND MISREPRESENTATION.

### I.—THE CRUSADE FOR PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

EVERY one must respect and honour the public spirit and independence which prompted Mr. Courtney to resign one of the most important posts in the Government, when he found that the Redistribution Bill contained no provision for the representation of minorities, a principle which he was well known to have dearly at heart. Such a course, followed by an active propaganda on his part, and on that of Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Albert Grey, for a scheme of proportional representation, as a substitute for the subdivision of the larger constituencies, demands a careful consideration of their proposal, even though it does not appear to commend itself at present to the constituencies. I have recently stated my opinion in public, as the result of some study of the various schemes which have been devised for giving effect to the principle, that the particular proposal now presented to the country is open to all the objections which have been urged in principle and in practice against previous experiments in the same direction, and involves difficulties and anomalies peculiar to itself. Postponing for the moment objections in principle, I propose to examine the scheme from the point of view of its exponents, and to show how it falls short of carrying out the objects they aim at, and what are the difficulties it involves—a task which can scarcely be effected within the limits of a speech.

The scheme on which the advocates of proportional representation, after a long incubation, have finally agreed is that known as the "single transferable vote." It has been specially devised and adopted with the object of avoiding the admitted defects of the "cumulative vote," as practised at the School Board elections. Under the new proposal, in a constituency returning more than two members, every elector would have but one vote; he would be permitted, however, to give a second, third, or other alternative vote; and when the number of first votes have been counted for any candidate, sufficient to insure his return, the remaining voting papers, on which his name appears first, would be counted for the second or alternative candidates named in them.

I think it must be obvious to the advocates of the scheme that it could scarcely bear satisfactory fruit unless the districts were large enough to return seven or nine members. In such case, each of the two main parties might make a selection from various interests; and there would very probably also be other candidates representing

special interests, sections, and cliques, who might be returned independently of the two main bodies of the electors.

In his article, however, in the *Fortnightly Review* for January, Mr. Courtney states that he does not think it would be prudent at present, on the first introduction of his new principle, to apply it to constituencies returning more than five members. He would therefore be content to redistribute the seats set free by the disfranchisement of small boroughs, so as to create as many three-membered, four-membered and five-membered constituencies as possible, without interfering with the existing divisions between counties and boroughs. This is a somewhat limited and unambitious application of the principle. Let us suppose, however, for the purpose of testing the scheme, that it is applied in this restricted manner.

In the case of three-membered constituencies, like the existing plan of minority voting already tried under the Act of 1867, the scheme would enable the principal minority to return one out of three members, but it would give no opportunity for smaller minorities to obtain a share in the representation. It would practically secure a representative to the main minority in every case; for unless the majority should be in proportion to the minority of more than three to one, it could not, under the scheme, return all three members. Suppose, for instance, 8,000 electors vote in a constituency returning three members; the quota is 2,001; and if three Liberals be contesting against one Tory, they must each obtain 2,001 votes, against 1,997 for the single Tory candidate, in order to secure the three seats. Practically no party majority is ever in so great a preponderance. A minority is always able to secure more than a fourth of the voters. It would be useless therefore for a majority ever to attempt to carry all three members. Under the present scheme of the minority vote, the majority when in a greater proportion than three to two can succeed in carrying all three seats; and in Birmingham and Glasgow, by very careful organization and by the most rigid party discipline, the majority has succeeded in successive elections in doing so; but under the proposed scheme it would be useless for them to make the attempt in the future. Political life would therefore become as stagnant in every borough where one party is in a secure majority as it has been in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Dorsetshire; and where parties are more evenly divided, the effect of the system would be very much what has been the experience of the existing scheme at Liverpool and Manchester, where it has become hateful to the electors.

Passing on to the next class of constituencies, those returning four members, it is obvious that where the contest is between two main parties, the return must in the vast majority of cases be two members of each, and the representation would be equally divided

between them. To enable one of them to obtain a majority of the members, its voters must be in proportion to the minority of considerably more than three to two. Suppose, for instance, in a constituency returning four members 10,000 electors vote, and the contest is between three Liberals and two Tories, 2,001 being the quota; to carry the return of the three Liberals, the votes must be not less for them than as follows—Liberals A (1), 2,001; A (2), 2,001; A (3), 2,001. Tories B (1), 2,001; B (2), 1,996, giving a total of 6,003 Liberal votes to 3,997 Tory votes; showing that the parties must at least be in proportion of three to two; and that even then success could only be achieved by the best possible organization. If there should be a candidate independent of either party, or if any considerable number of the Liberal voters should give their second or third votes for either of the Tory candidates, the result would be different, and the second Tory candidate would be returned. In practice, however, it is very rare for either party to be in so great a majority over the other as three to two. In the general election of 1880, out of 177 contested elections in constituencies in England and Wales, with a population of over 20,000, there were only thirty, or about one in six, where the majority was in this proportion to the minority.

The effect, therefore, of applying this scheme to four-membered constituencies would be to favour greatly the minorities by putting them on an equality with majorities, and to make it impossible for a majority in five constituencies out of six to obtain a majority of members; it would practically destroy in such cases political life, and would hand over the selection of members on both sides to the party caucus. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Courtney and Sir John Lubbock can ever have really considered the effect of applying their scheme to four-membered constituencies. The result would be so absurd, reducing representation to a mere even balance in five cases out of six, and, therefore destroying the motive for political activity, that the proposal is not worthy of serious discussion.

It is clear then that the scheme, if applied at all, must be tried in constituencies with not less than five members, the highest number which Mr. Courtney thinks it prudent to suggest. For the purpose of testing the scheme in such cases, let us suppose a constituency with five members, where 30,000 electors vote, and where 5,001 would be the quota. It must be obvious at once that if the contest is between candidates of the two main parties, and if there be no candidate independent of both parties, there will be three candidates on both sides, and the result will be that three members of the one and two of the other will be returned. To warrant one of the main parties making an attempt to secure four out of the five members, it must outnumber the minority in a proportion of more than

two to one, [*E.g.* in the case supposed, where the contest should be between four Liberal candidates and two Tory candidates; four Liberals might be returned if the votes were distributed as follows:—Liberals, A (1), 5,001; A (2), 5,001; A (3), 5,001; A (4), 5,001. Tories, B (1), 5,001; B (2), 4,996, showing a proportion of 20,004 Liberal voters to 9,997 Tory voters, or over two to one.] To enable a majority, however, to achieve this result, the party must be completely organized and subject to the most severe discipline. In practice it would be almost impossible to induce the whole party to vote *en bloc* for the ticket, and many a second, third, or fourth vote would be wasted by being given to independent candidates, or to the opposite candidates. A very much larger majority, therefore, than two to one, would be necessary to enable the party to return four out of five members. Experience also shows that the cases where a majority is in the proportion of two to one are extremely rare. In Ireland alone such a condition exists. The Nationalists would probably be able to carry four out of five members under such a scheme in most of the constituencies in the south and west. Elsewhere in the United Kingdom the return would, with rare exceptions, be three members of one party and two of the other.

The scheme, however, cannot be tested only by the case of an ordinary party fight between the two main parties of Liberals and Tories. The very essence of the plan is to encourage and enable independent sections of the constituencies to assert themselves, and to obtain a share in the representation. We must therefore consider what will be the effect of a candidate, independent of the two main parties, or of two independent candidates, obtaining a considerable number of votes. Let us suppose that, in an English or Scotch constituency returning five members, the Irish electors are sufficient in number to enable them to return a Home Rule member, as would very probably be the case in many five-membered constituencies in the manufacturing and mining districts; in such a case there would remain four members for the two main parties, and, as already shown, unless one of these two parties be in a proportion to the other of more than three to two, these four members must be equally divided between them. The constituencies therefore in nearly all such cases would be practically neutralised and nullified as regards the two main parties; the balance would reckon for the independent party. This, however, is not the worst of the position. A section obtaining votes, far below the quota, would in a very large number of cases be able to secure a member, and thus reduce the two main parties of the constituency to impotency. In the case I have supposed of 30,000 voters, 5,001 is the quota; but suppose the independent candidate to obtain 3,500 votes, leaving 26,500 votes for other candidates. In this case, if the two main parties are nearly evenly balanced

and vote according to the system proposed, it appears that the independent candidate would be returned, although he has nearly one-third less than the quota, and little over one-tenth of the total votes. The poll would be as follows:—Liberals, A (1), 5,001; A (2), 5,001; A (3), 3,398. Tories, B (1), 5,001; B (2), 5,001; B (3), 3,098. Nationalist, 3,500. In this case the Liberal votes average 4,460 for their three candidates, and the Tories 4,360, yet the independent candidate would be returned with 3,500 votes. This result might perhaps be avoided by very strict organization. Suppose the Tory party in such a case were to abandon voting on the proposed system, and after a careful canvas of its members, dividing their votes into three equal sections, to direct each section to vote for one of their candidates, the result would be that three Tories would be returned with 4,360 votes each, and two Liberals with 5,000 votes each, while the Independent candidate with 3,500, and the third Liberal with 3,398 votes would be rejected; and as a result the minority of Tories would obtain a majority of members. The knowledge that their opponents were adopting such a course, would probably induce the Liberals to do the same, and the result would be that the victory would be achieved by the party best organised, and whose voters most completely surrender themselves to the caucus, while the system proposed would be practically abandoned by all parties.

The case might be further illustrated by the introduction of other independent candidates. To whatever extent they are put forward, it appears certain that the system of voting by the ticket, with a view to obtaining the necessary quota, would tell against the two main parties of the constituency who should use it; and would almost certainly result in the return of one, if not more than one, independent candidate with many less votes, than properly justify such a position. It follows then that the system greatly favours the main minority; it also gives undue facility to independent sections and cliques to return members; and it makes it extremely difficult for a majority to secure for itself even a bare majority of members.

Another most serious objection to the system is one which has been frequently pointed out, namely, that it would in many cases reduce to a mere chance the question whether the second or third candidate on the party ticket would be returned. In the case supposed of a five-membered constituency, where three candidates only of each party are standing, the chance would rest between the second and third representatives of the party which is in a minority. In the case of an independent candidate being returned, in the face of a contest between three candidates of each of the main parties, the chance would be between the second and third candidates of both parties. Suppose, for instance, in either of these cases, that of three candidates, A, B, and C, A is the popular one, for whom all the party vote, and that

the party are nearly equally divided in voting in the order A, B, and C, and A, C, and B, the former having slightly the preference; when the voting papers have been counted, on which A stands first, sufficient to give him his quota, the subsequent voting papers are counted for B or C, as their names appear second on the lists; but it is obvious that whether the majority of what remain count for B or for C, depends entirely upon the proportion in which the heap already laid aside consists of more A, B, C votes or of A, C, B votes, which itself is a matter of chance; in the former case C would be elected, in the latter B. The result, therefore, as between B and C would be reduced to mere chance; and the candidate who has obtained a slight majority of votes may be beaten on the poll by one with fewer votes. How do the advocates of the scheme meet this objection? Mr. Grey says that if the second votes are given to B and C in proportion of two to one, then the chance of the second votes, after a good shuffle, coming out in the opposite order, so as to put C above B, are infinitely small, and may be neglected; and Mr. Courtney says that the chances are 4,000 to 1 against C being returned. Their assumption, however, is that the second votes are given in to B and C in proportion of two to one; but the case is very different where the second votes are given in nearly equal proportion; and it is evident that in such case the chance of the one or the other having a majority in the second heap becomes nearly equal. It may also happen, and indeed it is very certain to happen, that in one district of the constituency the voters will vote in the order A B C, and in another A C B, and that in consequence of a bad shuffling, whether accidentally or purposely, the A B C's will be drawn first, leaving the A C B's to the later draw. It is obvious in such a case that C may be returned in spite of B having the larger number of second votes. Any one familiar with election tactics must see what opportunities such a scheme affords for manipulation, and manoeuvres of all kinds. The contest will not more be between the two main parties, but between the second and third candidates of both of them, the first being certain of election.

I have hitherto considered the effect of the scheme as applied within the limits at present proposed by Mr. Courtney; but thoroughly to understand its working, it should be considered with reference to larger districts, returning nine or more members; in such cases the system would have greater play, it would give a fuller opportunity to various interests and sections to claim a share in the representation. On the other hand, the elements of chance and the other difficulties already explained, would be multiplied. In a constituency returning nine members the majority of voters could rarely or never hope to return more than a bare majority of the members. To secure six out of the nine members the majority must be greater than three to

two, and with the certainty of independent candidates, and of cross voting for the candidates low on the party list, this would practically be impossible. An independent candidate could also be returned with far less than the quota, while there are cases in which two independent candidates could be returned with each two-thirds only of the quota, while the average of the ten candidates of the two main parties would be much greater.

In an experiment made to test the scheme, with 70 voting papers, where 9 candidates were supposed to contest 7 seats, the two main parties being nearly evenly divided, and an independent candidate having nearly the quota, I found that 12 shuffles of the papers, filled always in the same manner, brought out 5 different results of the poll when counted on the principle of the system proposed, and it is clear that, with 70,000 voting papers, the result would be equally the subject of chance. Generally, it may be said that the larger the district and the more numerous the members, the more theoretically perfect would be the scheme from the point of view of Proportional Representation, but the greater the difficulties to a majority, the greater the facilities for sections and cliques, the greater the elements of chance. The climax would be reached in Mr. Hare's scheme, which is theoretically complete from the same point of view, but is wildly impossible and impracticable.

Let us now look at the practical working of the scheme in the ordinary conduct of the election in any large constituency which is subject to it. I have already shown that in districts returning five members, the contest will almost certainly be between three members of the one main party, and three of the other, complicated probably by the appearance of an independent candidate. In such case, two candidates of both the principal parties will practically be secure of being elected, and the main contest will really lie between the third candidates of the two parties and the independent member, though there may also be an internal struggle between the second and third candidates of either of the parties. How, under such conditions, is the contest to be carried on? What are to be the instructions or advice of the party organizers to their followers? If they advise their members to vote according to the order on the party ticket, it must be recollected that there is no equality in the position of their candidates. The first two on the list, if generally adopted, will be absolutely certain of election, and the last alone will bear the brunt of the contest. Who would care to occupy this place on the ticket with two colleagues in a position of such security? If the party organizers give no such advice, but recommend their followers to vote in the order of their own preference, it may well be that two of their candidates will run the risk of being defeated; but it is also probable that large numbers of the party would not understand the system, and would vote for the candidates in the alpha-

betical order in which they stand on the voting papers. There cannot be a doubt that the last in the alphabetical order will have a very poor chance. With respect to the order of preference it should be recollected that a first vote is worth at least double a second vote, and a second vote worth very much more than a third vote. How will it be possible to make the electors understand the mathematical value of their votes? How are rival interests to be brought into harmony? There being no equality in the position on the ticket, it will not be possible to split votes or to give or take on equal terms. How could a canvass be conducted? How could candidates last on the party list be expected to canvass for themselves and their colleagues in this order? What opportunities then for a candidate to play for his own hand! How, again, are sections of the party, not strong enough to secure a member independently for themselves, but claiming a share in the representation of the party, to be dealt with? Will not such sections be induced to run a candidate, contenting themselves with giving a first vote to a popular party candidate, and giving their second or third vote to a candidate representing their special interests? Again, a section of the party, large enough to return a member separately, may yet desire to give their first vote to the popular party candidate and their second vote to their special class candidate; how difficult it will be to make them understand that their second votes are of value only after the candidate first on their list has received his quota, and that consequently many of their second votes will be thrown away, that what remain will not be sufficient to return their candidate; and that the only result of their action will be to make it impossible for the party to return its three members.

Hitherto in political contests one of the main objects has been, by appeals on the platform or by personal persuasion, to urge individual and special cliques to subordinate their interests to those of the public, and to vote for the member or members who on the whole best represent the public interests, or are best qualified to fill the position of members. The very essence of the new scheme proposed to us is the reverse; it invites and enables special interests and cliques to secure a separate representation. It will be an obvious manœuvre of a party to start a candidate representing a special clique, in order to draw second or third votes from their opponents, while giving special instructions themselves to their followers that fourth or useless votes only are to be given to such candidates. In fact, there are endless opportunities for intrigue, manœuvring, and trickery, and the results would surprise none more than the enthusiasts who are supporting the scheme.

The scheme must further be tested by its universal application. If a minority in one part of the kingdom is to be artificially protected, why not in another? If cliques and sections of one class



of constituencies are to be afforded the opportunity of returning members, why not elsewhere? Mr. Courtney, indeed, writing to some Welsh correspondent, has recently said that he proposes at present not to extend the system to rural districts, but to confine the experiment to the larger towns and populous counties. He can scarcely suppose that the country will submit to the great towns, the strongholds of popular opinion, being emasculated by a scheme such as he proposes, while majorities in rural districts of a less advanced and popular kind are to be unchecked? To allow this would be to run a risk of that which what he and Sir John Lubbock frequently but erroneously put forward as one of the defects of the present system of majority voting, that it may lead to the return of a majority of members by a minority of the whole electorate.<sup>1</sup>

The illustrations I have given of the practical working of the scheme will, I think, show that it has the gravest defects, that it cannot even justly be called a scheme for proportional representation, that on the contrary, in nearly every case it will have the effect of giving a position to a minority beyond what it is entitled to, of enabling sections and independent parties to obtain a share in the representation which their numbers do not justify, and as a consequence making it difficult for a majority of electors even to obtain a bare majority of members, still less to secure its due share of the representation. It will also import the element of chance in a vast number of cases, and in every election will be the cause of intrigue and manœuvres fatal to true political life. In these respects it appears

(1) Sir John Lubbock in a recent controversy has persistently maintained in support of the above argument, on the authority of the agent of the Central Liberal Association, that in the election of 1874 there was a majority of the voting power in Great Britain for the Liberals of nearly 200,000, but that a large majority of Tory members were returned. I have maintained on my part, as the result of a personal investigation of the figures, that a fair estimate of the voting power of the two parties on that occasion shows a small majority for the Tories. This would be considerably increased if allowance were made for the greater value of county votes as compared with borough votes, due to the restricted franchise in counties. As the Tories had an immense majority in the counties, it would be necessary, in order to arrive at a fair comparison of voting power, to bring the county and borough votes to a common measure. More recently Sir John Lubbock has mainly relied for his argument on the contested elections only in 1874. It is true that the results of these contests show a very small majority of votes for the Liberals and a majority of members for the Tories, but a careful examination will prove that this was due (1) to the great inequality in size of the constituencies; (2) to the fact that the Tories were successful in a majority of the smaller constituencies; (3) to the inequality above referred to in the county and borough franchise. No sound general deduction can be drawn from contested elections only, and without taking into account the proportion of parties in the uncontested constituencies, a large majority of which returned Tories in 1874. The same objections apply to Sir John Lubbock's arguments from the result of the contested elections in Ireland in 1880. With nearly equal and very numerous electoral divisions, returning one member each, and with an equal franchise, there is practically no possibility of such a result from majority voting as Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Courtney fear. The cases they quote from America are those where the electoral divisions are few in number, or where they have been expressly gerrymandered with a view to this result.

to me to be worse than the cumulative vote system pure and simple, and to be yet far worse than the system of three-membered constituencies with the minority vote.

It might be that some few of these defects would be cured by very strict party organization, and by the members of the party surrendering their discretion and free choice completely to the caucus, and voting according to order, but this is precisely what the scheme is intended by its promoters to avoid and prevent. It appears, however, that the advocates of this plan have never carefully considered what would be the practical effect of its application; how party organizations would work it; what kind of transactions between candidates and between sections it would give rise to. They have supposed their ideal plan would be carried out in an ideal manner, and in the spirit which prompts its advocates. They have not reckoned that, if adopted, it would be at once laid hold of by the party caucus, by election agents, by central political agencies and all the like implements of party; they have thought that it would be a means of securing to parliamentary life the purest representatives of eclectic philosophers; but they have failed to appreciate how it may be used by independent and anarchical parties, by less pure and patriotic sections of the community, by special interests desirous of seeking their own advantage rather than the public good—such as the public-house interest, and others that could be named. Interests in such cases are far more powerful incentives to separate action than ideas or policy. Of ideas which are likely to claim expression and a share of representation, it is probable that the least enlightened, and those which amount to a craze or hallucination, will more readily separate themselves from the public interest and from partnership with others, than those which are more enlightened.

What then is the proposal of the Government to which this strange burlesque of representation, under the guise of philosophic fairness, is offered as an alternative? It is that of districts returning each one member, elected by the majority of voters. Hitherto, with the exception of Scotland and Wales, the general rule has been that of districts returning two members. Under the scheme now before the country there will be four hundred and twenty-four constituencies, of which four hundred will be represented by one member each, and only twenty-four, consisting exclusively of boroughs, will return two members. The counties, without exception, will be divided into districts with one member each, and the larger boroughs will share the same fate. These districts will be nearly of equal population.

Variety in representation will be attained by preserving the separate representation of existing boroughs from their surrounding rural districts, and by dividing the counties and larger towns, on the principle of separating districts with different interests, such as urban, mining, and agricultural interests.

It is not difficult to divine how the proposal for the utmost universal adoption of single-membered districts—a change of startling novelty, and one which a few months ago would have been considered impossible—came to be accepted by the leaders of both parties. It is well known that such a scheme formed no part of the original proposal of the Government, of which an incomplete edition was disclosed by the *Standard*, though it is probable that their proposal would have included the partial adoption of single-membered county districts, as an alternative to grouping the urban places, and for the purpose of carrying out the pledges which had been given that the separation of urban and rural interests would be observed. I have personally no knowledge of the course of the negotiations between the leaders of the two parties, but it is matter for reasonable and probable conjecture that the plan of partial creation of single-membered county districts, when discussed, commended itself to the Tory leaders as a preferable one to that of grouping, and that they were led to urge its universal application to the counties.

There are many reasons which would make such a division of the counties agreeable to the Tory party. It enables the better separation of agricultural interests from manufacturing, urban, and mining interests. The districts with between fifty and sixty thousand inhabitants will also be of a manageable size. The county divisions, as they stood, would have entailed great labour on candidates under the extended franchise. The influence of the squires may be greater in the smaller districts than over the wider areas. On the other hand, the division gives to the Liberals the hope of success in many country districts where hitherto they have had no chance.

Starting, then, from this common ground of agreement with respect to country districts, the question at once arose whether the same principle should be applied to the larger boroughs, to which more than two members were to be given. It may well be, as Mr. Courtney suggests, that the proposal for splitting up the larger boroughs into single-membered districts did not proceed from the Tory leaders in the first instance. Lord Salisbury would doubtless have been better pleased if he could have emasculated Radicalism in the great centres of population and political activity, by applying to them some such scheme as that proposed by the advocates of proportional representation. His speeches and writings in the recess indicated that he would gladly have adopted this for the great cities, while applying the system of single-membered districts in counties. Such a one-sided measure, however, could not be entertained for a moment. Proportional representation having been abandoned for the counties, was wholly out of the question for the larger towns. The only remaining alternatives, therefore, were those of single-membered urban districts, and districts returning two members; and it is easy to see that under the former the Tory party, generally the minority in the

large towns, will have a better chance of securing the representation of some of the districts than under the latter. In other words, the breaking up of towns into one-membered districts somewhat favours the minority.

If Mr. Courtney had protested against breaking up the great towns into one-membered districts, and had contended for two-membered districts, he would doubtless have found many supporters. There are those who think that one-membered districts will favour parochial candidates, and will tend to reduce the quality of members. He has not, however, taken this issue. It may be presumed that he and his friends prefer one-membered districts to two-membered districts, but they have sought to enlist the feeling which existed in some quarters against breaking up the great cities into districts, on behalf of their scheme for applying to larger constituencies their principle of proportional representation. There is, however, no evidence whatever that the larger towns would accept proportional representation in any shape, as the price of being left undivided. The division of the counties into single-membered districts has given all but universal satisfaction. Everywhere the various parties and sections of the constituencies have accepted the scheme without question, and have vied with one another in trying to make the best of it. It may confidently be said that no change of such importance has ever been so unanimously accepted. If there was at the first some little dissatisfaction in the large towns at being split up into single-membered districts, the feeling has quite subsided, when it was ascertained that the only alternative was the emasculation of political life by some scheme of proportional representation such as that under discussion; and as the question has been further considered, the opinion of the great constituencies, and especially those of the metropolis, has become daily more favourable to their division.

What will be the effect of the almost universal adoption of one-membered districts it will be difficult to foretell with any confidence. It may be expected to increase the personal influence of members. Those who serve their constituencies faithfully and well may be more certain of re-election. It will probably induce a greater attention to local institutions as the best means of securing the confidence of the district. Local influences and personal attentions will have their weight, but, on the other hand, the jealousies of rival local personages, if not higher and more public motives, will induce the electors in many places to select candidates of a more national and political type. It cannot be doubted that prominent politicians on either side of the House will never fail to find constituencies ready to return them. There are those who think that the system will accentuate the Liberal party, and tend to confine it within narrower and more radical limits. This may be the case in many places where the representation is now divided between two representatives of the opposite

extremes of the party. But, on the other hand, it must be recollected that there will be many districts where success for the party cannot be achieved by men of extreme opinions. To those who think the system will result in our great towns in returning men of a lower type, who have achieved a mere parochial reputation, we may point to the very varied range and high quality of the representatives for the existing metropolitan districts; there is every reason to hope that the multiplication of London districts will result in an equal variety, and in maintaining the average.

We may not unreasonably expect that the system of one-membered districts, though somewhat favouring the party which is in a minority, as compared with wider districts represented by two members or more, returned by majorities, will result in the accentuation of the verdict of the country. The majority of members returned will be in excess of the majority of voters. There need, however, be no fear that the minority will not have a very considerable representation, whichever party is successful. I have elsewhere endeavoured to show the importance and value of this effect of majority voting. Parliaments will be returned in which substantial majorities will have force and vigour enough to carry out the determination of the country, to support the policy of the executive which depends on the majority, and to prevent obstruction and defection impeding and defeating the legislation which the country desires. Such a result of majority voting is a hundredfold better than the result which would certainly accrue from the scheme under discussion, and from all other schemes of proportional representation, namely, the enfeeblement of the majority, the strengthening of the minority beyond its due, and the encouragement of cliques and sections.

Much has been said of the danger to be expected in Ireland from the extension of the suffrage with majority voting. It is the *bête noire* of Mr. Courtney and his friends. The Loyalists will be swamped; the Nationals will be supreme; they will carry ninety members; how can we hope to govern Ireland? These form their most taking and most plausible arguments to an English audience. They forget that the Protestant and loyal part of the population of Ireland is concentrated in Ulster in such a manner as to make the best of its numbers. It is not spread evenly over Ireland. Throughout the other three provinces it forms a very small minority of the population. The Nationalists do not, I believe, claim that they will be able to win more than fourteen out of the thirty-three seats in Ulster. There is every reason to hope that this is beyond their power, and that the Loyalists (if united) will be able to secure in Ulster, with the addition of two or three seats elsewhere, not fewer than twenty-five members, which is little below what their numbers entitle them to. A careful examination of the effect of the various schemes

of proportional representation will show that none of them, under the special conditions of Ireland,\* would secure better terms for the Loyalists, for in three-fourths of the country the Nationalists are strong enough to defeat any such schemes. Infinitely more important is it for those who dread the power of the Irish party, that the will of the majority in Great Britain shall not be enfeebled by the artificial protection of minorities, or by the encouragement given to independent sections, of which the Irish section in England would be the most influential and the most ready to avail itself of the opportunities afforded to it. If I am correct in the criticism I have made on the scheme which is now recommended to the country, it will result in equalising the main political parties in the House of Commons, and in placing whichever party is in power at the mercy of the Irish party.

Past experience shows that the executive is never over strong in the House of Commons. Criticism is as effective a weapon in the hands of a small minority as a large one; but a large minority is always under the temptation to intrigue with discontented supporters of the Government of the day, with a view to defeat its measures, irrespective of the merits of the case. In these days, when all real power is concentrated in the House of Commons, and through it in a committee of ministers daily and hourly dependent on its will, it would be the most fatal of errors to take any steps which shall weaken the majority and artificially increase the power of the minority.

If it be feared that the majority may use its power to excess, and carry measures which may make fundamental changes in the constitution or in the condition of property, a fear for which there is no foundation in the past proceedings of Parliament, surely the proper and the best course would be to strengthen the Second Chamber, which has no longer any control over the executive, so as to enable it to resist sudden innovations and impulses of legislation until the feeling of the country on the subject is more fully declared. That the House of Lords performs this duty with discretion and wisdom or effect few will now maintain. Those who desire to give support to the minority, would do well to turn their attention to the condition of the House of Lords, and to make it a more effective implement for the purpose for which alone it exists, rather than to devote their energies to weakening the power of the popular Assembly.

All experience of the past shows that nothing can be done, no popular measures carried, no stable policy pursued, unless the country speaks strongly through its representatives, and unless the majority returned is sufficient to overcome the active hostility of opponents and the more subtle and often unseen intrigues of its weaker and least reliable members.

G. SHAW-LEFEVRE.

## II.—THE COMING STEPS IN REPRESENTATION.

IN determining the method by which the representatives of the people are to be elected Mr. Gladstone says, "we have only a choice of evils." It is true that the operation upon the individual mind of any particular laws regulating conduct, or of systems of government in which the people may or may not have a share, is a problem of sociology. The confidence with which the results of certain political conditions of things are assumed is remarkably exhibited in the discussions on Representation. Of this the article in which Mr. Shaw-Lefevre condemns the attempt to give local minorities any weight in the national councils may be cited as a pregnant example. He concludes with a summary of what he terms facts, and describes as results, of the several systems of majority and proportional representation, of which he had treated, but of most of which alleged facts and results it is impossible to find any sufficient evidence.<sup>1</sup> "The aim of practical politics is to surround any given society with the greatest possible number of circumstances of which the tendencies are beneficial, and to remove or counteract, as far as is practicable, those of which the tendencies are injurious."<sup>2</sup> "In all that I have suggested on the subject of representative institutions my object has been to bring all the better tendencies into action, and give to the business of election even a sacred character."<sup>3</sup> It is important to keep this in mind in considering the great constitutional question now before us. The point which I desire to press is that such better influences will be evoked and brought into play by giving every constituency the widest choice of candidates. The Redistribution Bill proceeds on the contrary principle,—that such electoral power and discretion should be reduced to its minimum.

The proportional system is now brought to public attention, and advocated on the platform and in the Press by its ablest exponents. The reply of Mr. Gladstone, in the debate on the second reading of the Redistribution Bill, to the speech of Mr. Courtney was certainly not what might have been expected from him. It was rather what might have been heard in any amateur debating club. There might be humour in the ridicule which Mr. Gladstone cast on the reference that had been made to the opinion of President Garfield; but it was not worthy of the subject or the occasion. It is gratifying to observe that in a late note Mr. Gladstone expresses his satisfaction that the matter is to be well weighed, and receive full consideration. In a Bill for Redistribution, of which I had formed an ideal draft that appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 28th of February last,

(1) *Contemporary Review*, May, 1882, p. 733.

(2) *System of Logic*, by J. S. Mill, vol. ii. p. 485-

(3) *Election of Representatives*, 4th ed. p. 146, et seq.

instead of disfranchisement of boroughs, and increase of the members in the House, I proposed the enfranchisement of three or four hundred other towns in the kingdom, and the diminution of the number of members, with a view to more deliberation and less talk. The true democratic principle surely is that the people who assemble, whether it be in the Acropolis at Athens or on Salisbury Plain, and not the people who remain at home, determine the questions before it. It is not on the numbers of the population—counting all men, women, children, of all ages and capacities—that the electoral powers of the localities should be measured, but on the number who actually vote at every election. Nothing is more easy and practicable than this rule of apportionment; but it seems to be wholly left out of consideration by all.

The framers of the Redistribution Bill would seem to have regarded the question before them in the point of view in which it would be looked upon by candidates, and not that in which it would present itself to the electors. The main thought of the ordinary candidate is how he can best secure his seat. It is obvious that the more completely the constituencies can be impounded and segregated the more tractable they necessarily become, and the more readily they may be manipulated by the party leaders and managers. The pertinacity with which what is called "the element of chance" in the appropriation of the alternative vote is insisted upon as an objection, exhibits clearly that it is only in the light of its effect upon the candidates that it is regarded. If, they say, the Liberal voters put 1 against the name of Brown and 2 against Smith, the necessary quota may be given to Brown and Smith may not be elected, as he may not have enough votes after Brown's are put aside. The answer is that this, though scarcely possible if their party be strong enough to elect two members, is yet one of the accidents of life. You may desire to obtain a seat at the opera when all the places are previously taken. The object is to be secure that every elector shall, as far as possible, obtain the representative he desires. "That," says the objector, "is not what I want. I do not care about the electors; my complaint is that your plan causes Smith to lose his seat."

On the other hand the true object of the independent and conscientious elector is that he shall be empowered to make the best selection according to his judgment, and for this purpose to have the widest choice which is practicable. This exercise of judgment, if not wholly excluded, is reduced to its smallest possible limit by the proposed Redistribution Bill. The thorough electoral discretion which every voter should possess will be taken from more than half the people of the United Kingdom and be utterly thrown away. The voters in the one-member constituency may be canvassed by two or three candidates seeking the social status of an M.P., in not one of whom the



elector may have any confidence. In such circumstances his inclination will be to abstain from voting, unless he feels himself compelled as a matter of duty to vote for one who, though he may think him unfitted for the high position to which he aspires, may yet by his election prevent the success of another whom he considers still less eligible.

It is unnecessary to call the serious attention of any who duly appreciate the importance of the subject to the suppression and waste of intellectual power and deliberate judgment which might be gathered and employed in the construction of our governing body, if the proposed single-seated system be adopted. It is not merely the extinction of the minorities that have given their hearty support to the candidate who is outvoted. It is not for them only that proportional representation is sought, but for all those who, finding themselves unable to aid in the election of any person whom they regard as trustworthy and competent for the business of legislation and government, will have no inducement to take any part in a political struggle in which their efforts can have no useful result. It is not a choice of evils, as Mr. Gladstone describes it, which we have to make, but a choice of tendencies.

Adverting to the practicability of the proportional system, and the simplicity of its operation, especially by the less educated classes, it may be stated that they have been shown by several experiments. So long ago as 1869, it was tried in Harvard College, Massachusetts, the students taking the names of several authors and poets, and indicating their preferences, showing in the result the writer who was the most popular amongst them.<sup>1</sup> Many more recent trials have been satisfactorily made. It might be usefully introduced, and become an interesting and instructive lesson in our Public Elementary Schools. The pupils might be told to express on papers in the preferential form, the names of the poets, historians, or others, whom they most admire; or, say the trades or occupations in life on which they would prefer to enter, or any other object of comparison. It might be a valuable exercise in attracting attention and appreciation of the greater characters and events in history and science.

If the single-seated constituencies be not the best system, Mr. Gladstone asks, why does it prevail over the length and breadth of the representative world? The answer is, because the local majorities having once obtained the control will not part with it, or assent to any method of election by which it may be taken from them. Every contrivance is resorted to which can tighten their hold, and strengthen the power of the managers by whom the constituency is manipulated. The local parties may be entirely hostile on other matters, but on this

(1) A copy of the report will be found in the *Treatise on the Election of Representatives, &c.*, 4th ed. p. 351. Longmans. 1873.

they agree. The authorship of the Redistribution Bill is perhaps truly said to be somewhat composite, of the Erckmann-Chatrian kind. It is not known how much is due to Mr. Gladstone or to Lord Salisbury, but it may not unreasonably be suspected that some part of it is due to the influence of Mr. Chamberlain. I believe his name will have an honourable place in the history that will record his labours on behalf of the merchant seamen, but of the modifications of our constitutional system which he seems to desire I entertain great dread. The electoral and single-member district once established, the attempt to introduce the payment of members, thereby to make the dominance of the majorities irrevocable, will certainly follow. In carrying this out Mr. Chamberlain may propose to apply, we will say, a quarter or half a million annually of the public revenue for the purpose. It is against such a consequence that the public and Parliament should be warned, whilst the great changes in our constitution to be made by the Redistribution Bill are under consideration. The payment of members appears to me one of the gravest of the coming questions. Their payment by their several constituencies is perfectly consistent with principle, and was a practice which we know existed to the time of Andrew Marvell. The position of a Member of the House of Commons is now one of praiseworthy ambition to men of public spirit, of whom the greater number have no desire for pecuniary advantage. Let it once be made a salaried office, and it becomes a means of obtaining a maintenance, and thus a temptation to clever adventurers who would prefer the excitement and notoriety of political life to the quiet toil and comparative obscurity of a professional or mercantile occupation, in which they might otherwise be compelled to engage. The success of such candidates would ultimately lead to the degradation of the House. The experience of General Garfield was no doubt enough to teach him its result in the United States on the composition of their National Assembly, as expressed in the significant maxim, "the spoils to the victors." It would bring forward candidates to whom the seat would be everything, and who to gain it would be ready to pander to all kinds of prejudice or folly which promised them success. That some would doubtless be still chosen on higher grounds would not prevent the deterioration of the House as a whole.

It is desirable that this question especially should be brought to the careful attention of the working classes, who will hereafter have more representatives of their own order. The expediency of providing for the payment of their expenses is likely to be presented to them in a plausible form; but it is important that they should see that their true and adequate representation in Parliament is not to be secured, but would be retarded in a great measure, by the establishment of a salaried Legislature. In the first place, the advocates of State salaries for all the members, rich or poor, do not ask for that which the working

classes should primarily insist upon, the relief of candidates from the official expenses of the election. This is an impediment to the candidature of all who, or whose friends, have not money to spare, and one which the present advocates of the Redistribution Bill would, no doubt, wish to permanently retain. Its abolition would increase the number of candidates, and often probably endanger the influence of the caucus. Let our first demand, therefore, be that the official expenses of the elections be no longer a burden on the candidate, but a charge on, and form a part of the local expenses of the borough or district. The door is thus opened to the poor as well as to the rich. The next thing to be considered is the manner in which the State properly might and should contribute towards the expenses of members who, chosen by their constituents to represent them and take a part in the national councils, cannot do so without suspending the work from which they derive their maintenance. The cost of a temporary residence in London during the sitting of Parliament will fall heavily on a miner from the north, an artisan from the midlands, or a labourer from the south. It would be perfectly just and wise that a sum—equal, say, to what Mr. Chamberlain would perhaps spend in one year on the salaries of his coadjutors—should be expended in providing dwellings free of cost near Westminster Hall for any members of insufficient means, or whose constituents subscribe or are willing to subscribe towards their maintenance, and who desire that such accommodation should be afforded to them. There is now an unoccupied plot of ground adjacent to St. Thomas's Hospital, within five minutes' walk of the House, which might well be thus used. Fifty or more convenient sets of apartments in flats might here be erected, and suitably furnished and attended by caretakers. They could be let to other persons when not required by members. The block might include a general reading-room, and a library containing all the Parliamentary papers, together with useful books of reference. The contributions needed from the constituents, in addition to this public accommodation, would be absolutely insignificant. The member will not be likely to have less than two or three thousand constituents, and a weekly subscription of a very small coin from every one of them, or even from one-half of their number, would produce more than the ordinary wages of a workman. This connection of the member with the constituents of his class, and their knowledge of the distinct share they thus have in the national government, is calculated to promote a sense of responsibility, and to direct attention to political questions, the effect of which will not fail to be generally of an elevating character. It is tolerably certain that, if there were a State salary for the members, the chances of success of the candidates of the working class would be reduced. The majorities, composed of other classes in the localities, would put for-

ward their impecunious protégés, who, whatever their pretence of a regard for the interests of labourers, would have no real sympathy with them. Their needs and requirements are best known to those who have felt them, and they will not fail to find worthy representatives from among themselves.

Assuming that the Redistribution Bill now before Parliament must be taken as the basis of any measure which both parties will adopt, let us see what amendments may still be made, or what measures taken to avert or diminish its evils. Cannot the inhabitants of the greater cities and towns—Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, and others—be awakened to the magnitude of the present crisis in their local and municipal life, and be induced to arise and protest against their proposed vivisection? Instead of submitting to be parcelled out in so many divisions of streets, let them demand of Parliament the preservation of their integral existence, and the power of electing according to their discretion, on the proportional method, the candidates they prefer from among all who offer themselves for their city or town. For the preservation of the political status of Liverpool, connected, as it is, with my earliest associations and labours on subjects of public import, I would earnestly plead. In the library of the Athenæum there, which owed its foundation to their illustrious townsman, the historian of the Medici, I gathered materials for a publication in support of one of the first of the legislative attempts of Mr. Huskisson to promote commercial freedom. This was at a time when steam power was yet in its early development, and the tunnel of the railway was being made which was to connect Liverpool with Manchester. If Liverpool had then been divided into wards, would any of them have been represented by Canning or Huskisson? For the nine seats to be appropriated to Liverpool, there would probably be many candidates having more or less claims to the public confidence, from whom the voters, under the proportional system, with the single and alternative vote, might elect the members whom the several quotas of voters respectively think most worthy to represent their great and enterprising city and population. Why should such an exercise of their mental powers be denied to the inhabitants of this and other local communities? Surely the inhabitants of Dublin and Belfast, and the provinces of Ireland, are likely to be more truly represented if they are permitted to associate themselves voluntarily, than by their separation and confinement within limited boundaries, thereby leaving them everywhere in the power of the majority.

The greatest blow to any expectation of bringing to the business of election all the valuable elements which exist and might be collected and utilised, is the intended division of the metropolis. It is to the voluntary associations which might be formed out of the vast population, viewed in its imperial, professional, educational, and

other multitudinous aspects, gathered together in this national centre, that I have always looked as the constituencies which would under the proportional system be represented by the most distinguished and able men in the kingdom. Dealing with this subject, a quarter of a century ago I ventured to point to the possibility of a time when foreigners would behold in the members representing the metropolis "a condensed picture of the greatness of our country, and recognise in it a triumphant display of the dignity and excellence of its institutions."<sup>1</sup> Is it impossible that instead of the arbitrary grouping together of persons, without any common standard or conception of the merits or qualifications of the candidate that should be chosen, but solely on the ground that they are registered as voters in the same neighbourhood, there may be substituted a power of individual association and concurrence resulting from their application of the moral and intellectual tests to which those who seek to become members of Parliament should be subjected?

Whether any attempt to prevent the waste of so much of the best intellect of the country be or be not successful, let the nation have in future the aid of women, as well as men, in the work of election. We have here an element the importance of which has never, in the popular mind, been justly estimated. We know that vast numbers amongst them are engaged in unselfish and praiseworthy labours for the relief of suffering and distress and the elevation of the poor. Let them, no longer excluded from the franchise, be empowered to bring to bear their appreciation of public merit, and their desire for the good, the improvement, and happiness of the people, in aid of the great task of selecting the most worthy to represent them. On the value of this addition to the constituencies, to say nothing of the injustice of the exclusion, let us listen to some of the last words of Mr. Fawcett when addressing his constituents in the Town Hall, Shoreditch, in April last: "There is not a subject discussed in Parliament in which women are not as deeply interested as men. War not only brings to them its burdens, but it often brings the sorrow and anguish of a desolated home; the widowed mother may be made childless, the sister may mourn a brother who will be seen no more. Social questions are likely to engage an increasing share of the attention of Parliament, and is there any social question in which women are not deeply concerned? Education is a not less priceless blessing to them than it is to men." There could not be a more powerful appeal from the voice that is gone. Whatever else may be done or omitted, let us not be without the ameliorating influences of the votes of women at the general elections of the future.

THOMAS HARR.

(1) *Electing Representatives*, &c., 4th ed. p. 213. Longmans. 1876.

## A PIOUS LEGEND EXAMINED.

THE article contributed by Principal Tulloch to the last number of this Review is one among several recent proofs that Coleridge's reputation as a "spiritual thinker," to use the writer's expression, is still regarded with a jealous reverence by many men still living. As I have been accused in some quarters with having unduly disparaged it, I avail myself with pleasure of the opportunity kindly afforded me by the Editor of amplifying the views which I have perhaps too briefly expressed on this subject elsewhere.

What, to begin with, is the exact meaning of the expression, "a spiritual thinker"? I do not complain that it is a particularly vague or indefinite expression; on the contrary, I am quite ready to admit that if its proper force be given to the substantive as well as to the adjective, the phrase will serve to define, with a good deal more precision than is common, the true capacity in which Coleridge must, for the purposes of this discussion, be exclusively regarded. Only it is necessary to stipulate that the substantive *shall* get its proper force assigned to it as well as the adjective; it is necessary to insist that the element of reasoned and systematic thought in Coleridge's religious speculations shall be treated as no less important than their spirituality; and this is exactly what Coleridgians as a rule refuse or neglect to do. They cannot long descant upon the theology of their master without dropping its doctrinal ingredient altogether, and falling back upon the fervour of the aspirations which abound in it, the sublimity of the language in which it often expresses itself, the depth and wealth of the emotional experiences to which it testifies. But this, I submit, is simply giving up Coleridge as a religious thinker, at least in that strict sense of the expression which one half of their habitual exaltations of him in this capacity implies. It is giving him up as a religious thinker in the sense of a religious philosopher. Religious thinking of the detached and unsystematic kind is, of course, to be found in more or less abundance, and sometimes of very penetrating quality, in the utterances of every devout and intelligent mind. Such utterances are never all ejaculations—precatory, or laudatory, or what not. David is spiritual thinker as well as spiritual poet; so, and even more emphatically, is the author of the Book of Job; so is the author of the *Imitatio*. In all of these, among prayers and thanksgivings and lamentations, we find thoughts profound, luminous and awakening, upon the Divine essence, upon the nature of man, upon the tangled scheme of things, upon the mysterious purpose of the ages. But the disciples of Coleridge would be far from content

with ascribing to him only that kind of "spiritual thinkership" which such scattered reflections and meditations would attest. Their claim for their master is that he was a thinker on divine things, in the sense in which not David, but Pascal, was such a thinker; or rather in the sense in which Pascal would have earned this title had he lived to systematise—as Coleridge did partially in his lifetime, and as was more elaborately done for him after his death—the philosophy of conduct and belief which may be evolved from his detached reflections. They claim, in a word, a place of commanding dignity and authority for Coleridge as a *religious philosopher*, as a teacher to whom they owe a much desired philosophico-religious synthesis—as a *ductor dubitantum*, in fact, who succeeded by an entirely new and irrefragable dialectic method in giving the doubters of his own and even of a subsequent generation a reason for the Christian faith that was struggling within them.

This is a perfectly plain and intelligible proposition; and though it did not and does not seem to me a demonstrable one, I feel that it would be presumptuous on my part to lay any great stress on an opinion contested by so many much better authorities. All I contend for is that the position should be supported by relevant evidence: surely no very exorbitant condition, but one nevertheless which has been in scarcely any recent instance observed. Nearly all the adverse judgments which I have met with upon my own humble efforts to estimate the spiritual teaching of Coleridge are open to this observation. Their arguments do not invite an answer, for the simple reason that they are not arguments addressed to the point in issue. That point in issue was whether, in a certain monograph upon Coleridge, the meaning, value, and success of that great man's theological, or rather philosophico-theological, teachings had or had not been imperfectly apprehended and inadequately measured. Now, attempts have been made to prove the affirmative of this thesis by such propositions as the following:—(1) that Coleridge deeply influenced a certain school of Anglican mystics; (2) that the late Mr. Mill said that, with the exception of Bentham, "no Englishman of recent date has left his impress so deeply in the opinion and mental tendencies of those among us who attempt to enlighten their practice by philosophical" (not a word about *religious*) "meditation;" (3) that Mr. Charles Buller, "a sceptic and man of the world, when speaking in the House of Commons on the Pension List, used language to the same effect as that of Mr. Mill;" (4) that Mr. Charles Buller expressed to Sir Edward Strachey "his sense of the great value of Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* as a method of thought, though he was not interested" (this is surely rather an important qualification) "in his theology as such." Three out of the four above irrelevancies are taken from a letter of Sir Edward Strachey, addressed to a weekly

periodical. It would be invidious to assign any original authorship to such commonplaces as (5) that Coleridge had an extraordinary grasp of moral and spiritual problems; (6) that all he wrote about religion (as, indeed, about everything else) abounded in deeply suggestive thoughts; (7) that the language in which he clothes his thoughts is suffused by a flow of religious emotion which would of itself account for its extraordinary effect upon devout minds; (8) that he is master of an eloquence which sometimes rises into sublimity. This is really no caricature of the ordinary mode in which Coleridgians conduct the controversy. It does not at all exaggerate their tranquil indifference to the point to be proved. And yet if any one had challenged the fundamental position of Positivism, or the theory that the moral depravity of the expiring century is exclusively responsible for the appearance in the heavens of a new and abnormally offensive kind of cloud, it would hardly have been thought relevant to reply to the first challenge, that Mr. Frederic Harrison is a writer of remarkable eloquence; or to the second, that no one has ever approached Mr. Ruskin in magical descriptions of nature. Did Coleridge, ay or no, construct a philosophy of Christianity which was at once new and true and accepted and permanent? That is the question; and it is the affirmative of it, and of every constituent of it, which the Coleridgian has got to prove. His contention is that Coleridge invented a new philosophical synthesis of the religious and intellectual elements in human nature, that it was so obviously and convincingly true as to be at once accepted by a great number of contemporary minds, and that it still subsists as the rational basis of much subsequent Christian belief. That, I repeat, is the contention of the Coleridgians; but I must say that never and nowhere, until the appearance of Principal Tulloch's paper in these pages last month, have I seen any genuine attempt to develop and establish it.

Not that Principal Tulloch would limit Coleridge's services as a spiritual teacher to the establishment of a philosophical basis for religion. That is the minimum of the claims which a disciple of Coleridge must put forward, and this particular disciple—if one ought so to describe him—advances considerably more. He credits the author of the *Aids to Reflection* with having, in the *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, adjusted the respective claims of criticism and inspiration, and, in the volume, *On the Constitution of Church and State*,<sup>1</sup> propounded the true theory of civil and ecclesiastical relations. On both of these claims I should for the present prefer to reserve detailed comment, contenting myself in this place with remarking

<sup>1</sup> Principal Tulloch makes two complaints against me with respect to this work: one (p. 13, *note*) that I strangely commend it as "yielding a more characteristic flavour of the author's style" than the *Aids to Reflection*; the other (p. 24), that I never mention it at all. I feel sure that so candid a critic will not seek to convict me on both charges. For myself, I plead guilty to the former only.



that the only serious question which could arise with regard to them is whether the views propounded by Coleridge in the two volumes in question can be regarded as in any sense peculiar to his specific religious teaching. It is on the first and by far the most important of the three claims that the whole controversy hinges. Principal Tulloch rightly puts it in the forefront of his dissertation, and devotes the largest amount of his space to expounding and fortifying it. Let me examine as briefly as may be the heads of his argument.

First and chiefly, he says, in the *Aids to Reflection*, "Coleridge may be said to have transformed and renewed the current ideas of his time about religion." That, I may pause to admit, is unquestionably true; but, as we shall see when we come to examine with Principal Tulloch what these current ideas were, it is saying very little: it is at any rate not saying nearly as much as the case of the Coleridgians requires. Given the dominance of a narrow, hard, essentially unintellectual school of religious thought at the time when the *Aids to Reflection* appeared, and the sudden shock communicated to the "current ideas" from the impact upon them of so broad, sympathetic, and powerful a mind might well—indeed, must inevitably—have "transformed and renewed" them. The personal magnetism of such a mind would do this, apart from the substance of the ideas engendered in and imparted by it. The influence was new; but the ideas need not be, nor were they, as Principal Tulloch candidly admits. No one, he says, knew better than Coleridge himself that there was nothing new in his "Platonic Realism." It was merely a restoration of the old metaphysic which had preceded the "mechanical systems" that became dominant in the reign of Charles II. He himself constantly claims to do nothing more than repeat the principles of Hooker, of Henry Moore, of John Smith, and Leighton, of all of whom he spoke as "Platonising divines." No; the novelty was not in the ideas themselves, but in the method of their employment. The "religious teaching of Coleridge came upon his generation as a new breath, not merely or mainly because he revived these ancient principles, but because he vitalised anew their application to Christianity, so as to transform it from a mere creed or collection of articles into a living mode of thought embracing all human activity."

Here, then, we seem to have reached something definite. Coleridge's teaching transformed and renewed the current ideas of his time about religion; but that in itself was not much. For the ideas of his time about religion were the Evangelical ideas; they were the commonplaces of a theory which affected to sever the religious entirely from the intellectual life; and any attempt, therefore, whether well or ill directed, to intellectualise religion was bound, if it attained any measure of acceptance at all, to transform and renew the ideas in question. It proves nothing as to the soundness or unsoundness of a particular philosophy that it upsets conceptions from which all

philosophy whatever is excluded. But it is going a good deal farther than this to say that in the philosophy in question ancient principles were so applied as to "transform Christianity from a mere creed or collection of articles into a living mode of thought embracing all human activity." This, although stated in terms of the religious rather than of the philosophical vocabulary, may well be the effected union of religion and philosophy of which we are in search. Naturally, therefore, one proceeds with heightened curiosity to the account of the method by which this transformation of Christianity was brought about. But alas! Principal Tulloch is here as disappointing as other Coleridgians. His very next sentence, indeed, disappoints. "Coleridge," he says, "was no mere metaphysician." Yes; but this is the very point at which one expects the metaphysician to come in. In his place, however, appears a very different character, "the student of spiritual life quickened by a peculiarly vivid and painful experience." Excellent as such an experience may be for a religious monitor, it is surely as bad a preparation as possible for a philosophical inquirer. Give a man a sufficiently vivid and painful experience of the facts of his spiritual nature and as a rule he will abandon all attempts at philosophy, and take refuge in a purely supra-rational, or, as some unfriendly critics might describe it, a purely superstitious creed. If he still continues to rationalise he will be irresistibly, though perhaps unconsciously, attracted towards particular doctrines in the ratio, not of their intellectual reasonableness, but of their consolatory power. This, however, by the way; we come in due time to an exposition of Coleridge's philosophico-theological work in terms of philosophy; and here, if a lay critic may say as much, without impertinence, of the work of a theologian, the general theological bearings of the *Aids to Reflection* seem to me to be accurately and exhaustively pointed out. But then I cannot see that the book has any claim to be ranked, at least by men who read it as Principal Tulloch evidently does read it, that is to say, with the same metaphysical reservations which his language seems naturally to imply, as in any sense an organon of religion at all. I cannot see that Coleridge did in this work, or in all his religious works taken together, "make Christian doctrine alive to the reason as well as the conscience, tenable as a philosophy as well as an evangel;" or at least that he performed this valuable service for anybody who needed to have it performed for him—for anybody, in other words, whose reason had not already accomplished the even more difficult feat of assimilating the transcendental dogmas of the Coleridgian metaphysic.

For what are the conditions which such a work as Coleridge is credited with accomplishing must fulfil? They could hardly, I imagine, be better stated than they are by Principal Tulloch in defining the twofold character of the work which Coleridge had to do. "He had to maintain on the one hand the essential divinity of

man, that 'there is more in him than can be rationally referred to the life of nature and the mechanism of organisation,' and on the other hand to show that this higher life of the spirit is throughout rational—that it is superstition and not true religion which professes to resolve 'men's faith and practice' into the illumination of such a spirit as they can give no account of, such as does not enlighten their reason or enable them to render their doctrine intelligible to others. He fights, in short, alike against materialistic negation and credulous enthusiasm."

Precisely. Well, what is the philosophic basis on which he rests the essential divinity, or, in other words, the spirituality of man? Simply on the existence of will. "If there be aught spiritual in man the will must be such. If there be a will there must be spirituality in man." He assumes both positions, as Principal Tulloch admits; but of course one cannot complain of that. A metaphysic of religion cannot be free from metaphysical difficulties; and the utmost that can be demanded of any philosophisation of Christianity is that it shall contain no *more* "antinomies of the reason" than philosophy has already encountered for herself. Neither free-will nor necessity is in itself conceivable; but logically, of course, there is no intermediate theory of human action, and Coleridge was as much entitled to base his theology on the free-will theory as Jonathan Edwards was to base his upon its opposite. It is by the use which he makes of the assumption that his claims to have constructed a philosophic organon of religion must be judged. What, then, is his next step? His next step after positing the will as free is to make certain propositions concerning it, which, though no doubt all of them quite unimpeachable from the theological point of view, appear to me altogether to efface the distinctive lines of what one had understood to be his philosophical doctrine. "I profess a deep conviction," he writes, "that man is a fallen creature, not by accident of bodily constitution or any other cause, but as diseased in his will, in that will which is the true and only strict synonym of the word 'I,' or the intelligent self. Man being diseased in his will, he cannot act righteously of himself. Every true Christian must attribute his distinction not in any degree to himself, not to 'his own resolves and strivings,' 'his own will and understanding,' still less to 'his own comparative excellence;' but to God, the Being in whom the promise of life originated, upon whom its fulfilment depends." But surely the seeker after truth, who may have thus far thought that Coleridge was leading him to religious truth by the winding but still traversable paths of a rational philosophy, will at this point come to a halt, and decline to follow his guide down the alley which he is just entering. "You may lead me," he will say stoutly, "in any other direction you like, but *that* I know of my own knowledge is the road to nowhere. It is a *cul-de-sac*, for I have tried

it before. It leads you straight to the 'grace' controversy, and when you once get into that—well, you know the only way of quitting it."

"Myself when young did eagerly frequent  
 Doctor and saint, and heard great argument  
 About it and about: but evermore  
 Came out by the same way that in I went."

Seriously, what is to be said of a religious philosophy which begins by assuming the freedom of the will, and then, quite carelessly and casually, as it were, proceeds to limit its freedom to an extent just sufficient to let in the whole of that interminable controversy which has driven men on one side into sceptical materialism, on the other into irrational mysticism, the very two enemies against whom Coleridge, as we have been rightly told, was equally at war? There is a certain naïveté in Principal Tulloch's remark that "here" (that is, in his theory of righteousness) "Coleridge joins the Evangelical school, as, indeed, every school of living Christian truth." To be sure he does; but then what becomes of his claim to have corrected the Evangelical notion that Christianity is "something superadded to the highest life of humanity," rather than "the perfect development of that life"? Why, by Coleridge's own admission, Christianity, "the distinction of a Christian," is "something superadded to the highest life of humanity," that something being the Divine grace. Of what avail was it for him to show that "man is essentially a religious being, having a definite spiritual constitution," if man is just as dependent for practical religion, for righteousness, on certain mystical impulses communicated *ab extra*, as any vessel of wrath or grace to which the most mechanical of Calvinist theologians ever degraded him?

So much for Coleridge's theosophy in its application to the practical side of Christianity. At its very outset, as we have seen, it trips over the free-will and grace controversy, and entangles itself in that very mysticism which it professed to translate into terms of the reason. Let us now inquire what success appear to attend it on the strictly doctrinal side. And here, of course, a disciple of this philosophy may fairly stipulate that no unreasonable demands be made upon it. No philosophy can, of course, be expected to rationalise the transcendental dogmas of the Church, so as to reduce them to the fully comprehensible axioms and definitions of an ordinary human science. *Exit in mysteria* is just as true of philosophy as it is of religion. It would be absurd to object to the Coleridgian system that it fails to bring the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, &c., within the grasp of the human understanding. It is enough if the approaches to these dogmas are made easier by that system, enough if the dogmas themselves can be commended to acceptance as theological incomprehensibilities by an exhibition of their analogy to

those conclusions in the metaphysical order which the mind is no more able to reject than it is to comprehend them. The relations between the subject and object, for instance, lead back the metaphysician into impenetrable mystery. The modes of interaction between mind and matter are not only in themselves incomprehensible, but it can be demonstrated (in some philosophies, indeed, it is assumed as self-evident) that the mind possesses no organ of cognition wherewith to comprehend them. Yet we are absolutely compelled to assume certain relations between mind and matter, between the subject and the object, and to formulate propositions concerning them, which in reality convey no more "graspable" conception to the human understanding than does the dogma of the Trinity. If Coleridge, then, could have succeeded in showing (as indeed it was clearly his plan and intention to show) that the human mind is driven to the acceptance of these incomprehensibles in theology by an intellectual necessity analogous to that which constrains it to accept the incomprehensibles of metaphysics, the claim of the Coleridgians on behalf of their master might be allowed. But how stands the case? Let us take the first, greatest, and most mysterious of all the Christian dogmas, that of the Trinity, and examine Coleridge's method of dealing with it as exhibited in the elaborate exposition of his disciple, Mr. Green.

Having deduced the idea of God from man's consciousness of "an individual will perpetually affirming itself," Mr. Green proceeds (after Coleridge) to evolve the idea of the Trinity, by what he considers an equally necessary process, from two of the invariable accompaniments of that introspective act whereby a man becomes conscious of himself. "For as in our consciousness," he proceeds, "we are under the necessity of distinguishing the relation of 'myself' now as the *subject* thinking, and now as the *object* contemplated in the manifold of thought, so we might express the relations in the divine instance as *Deus subjectivus* and *Deus objectivus*—that is the Absolute Subjectivity or Supreme Will uttering itself as, and contemplating-itself in, the Absolute Objectivity or plenitude of Being eternally and causatively realised in his Personality. Whence it follows," he goes on to argue, "that the idea of God the Father as necessarily involves the idea of God the Son as the 'I' who, as the thinking subject, contemplate myself, implies the contemplated 'Me' as the object thought of. Again, the man who reflects on the fact of his consciousness, which discloses to him the unavoidable opposition of object and subject in the self of which he is conscious, cannot fail to see that the conscious mind requires not only the distinction in order to the act of reflection in itself, but the continual sense of the relative nature of the distinction and of the eternal oneness of the mind itself." Hence, runs the argument, the idea of the first Two Persons as necessarily involves the idea of the Third Person as the contemplation of the "Me" by the

"I" implies the perpetual consciousness that the contemplator and the contemplated—the "I" and "Me"—are one.

Such is the nature of Coleridge's endeavour to show that the idea of the Trinity is involved in the idea of God, and arises out of it by an implication as necessary as that which connects together the three phases of consciousness above described as attendant upon every self-contemplative act of the individual mind. And such an endeavour is undoubtedly conceived in the true rationalistic spirit. Nothing, I quite admit, could have been more effective for Coleridge's purpose, a more genuine realisation of his plan, than to have shown that the normal act of self-contemplation involved a mystery as profound as, and not essentially differing from, the mystery of the Trinity. But has he done so? Can any one seriously say that the Trinitarian dogma is made—I will not say more comprehensible, for that would be to use misleading language; but, a more readily acceptable incomprehensibility—by the process above recited. In other words, is the acceptance of it really proved to entail no greater effort on the human mind than it is every moment exerting in the act of reflection upon itself? I cannot understand how any one can maintain such a proposition. Surely the process of analogical reasoning above set forth is on the face of it open to the alternative objection that it proves either too much for metaphysics or too little for theology—that if it really establishes the doctrine of the Trinity, it attributes a triune personality to every human being; and that unless it does attribute such a personality to man it cannot have any relevance to the doctrine of the Trinity, at least as understood by orthodox theologians. That the Divine mind when engaged in the act of self-contemplation must be conceived under three *relations* is doubtless as true as that the human mind when so engaged must be so conceived; but that these three *relations* are so many objective *realities* is a proposition which surely cannot be affirmed in one case without implicitly affirming it in the other. For aught I know, the distinction between a relation and a person may have been indifferent to Coleridge; but it is impossible for him or for any one else to contend that orthodox Christianity regards the two terms as convertible in connection with this particular doctrine, or in other words, that it is orthodox to think of the Trinity as a mere triplicity of relations. And indeed it is not open to Coleridge so to treat these terms in their application to the next of the great Christian dogmas.

We can see this clearly enough in what Principal Tulloch has to say about the connection of Coleridge's views on the Trinity with his views on the Atonement. Of his Trinitarianism Principal Tulloch observes, certainly with no excessive rashness, that it has been "supposed" to be the "most transcendental and so to speak Neo-Platonist of all his doctrines." But "truly speaking," he adds, "his Trinitarianism, like his doctrine of Election, is a moral rather

than a speculative truth. The Trinitarian idea was indeed true to him notionally . . . but the truer and more urgent spiritual basis of the doctrine of the Trinity, even to his own mind, was not its rational but its moral necessity. Christ could only be a Saviour as being divine. Salvation is a divine work. The idea of redemption involves belief in the divinity of our Lord. And our Lord's divinity again involves the Trinitarian idea, because in and through this idea alone the Divinity of Christ can be received without breach of the unity of the Godhead." I will not pause to notice the extraordinarily mystical import of this last hard saying, but will simply ask whether the admissions in the passage above quoted do not amount to a surrender of the whole Coleridgean case. They surely point to a total dissociation of those two elements in Christianity, the rational and the moral (or more properly speaking the emotional), which Coleridge was supposed to have victoriously united. It certainly seems to me that when a philosopher whose self-proposed task is to show, not only as against infidelity, that the existence of God is to be deduced from the constitution of the human mind, but, as against Socinianism, that the existence of a triune Deity is also to be so deduced—it seems to me, I say, that when a philosopher committed to this undertaking 'lays down the proposition that "the idea of Redemption involves belief in the divinity of our Lord," he is either representing a mere deliverance of the emotions as an information of the mind, or he is virtually reciting an identical proposition, itself based upon an assumption which those whom he is supposed to be addressing would deny. No doubt there is a certain idea of the Redemption, which "of necessity involves the divinity of Christ;" but that idea is one which cannot by any ingenuity of analysis be shown to belong to the original constitution of the human mind, or to arise by necessary implication, or to be deducible by analogy, therefrom. It is, in other words, essentially an idea which presupposes a certain purely moral or emotional impression of the nature of sin and of the relations established between the Deity and mankind by the existence of sin. This Coleridgean dictum therefore can only be made formally true by becoming materially illicit, as conceived in terms of another organ than that of the understanding. If by "the idea" of redemption involving the divinity of our Lord is meant "my own," the Coleridgean idea, then the proposition is true but valueless: for the reason that this Coleridgean idea is not evolved by those processes to which its author undertook to confine himself. If, on the other hand, "the idea" is to be understood as extending to other theories of the Redemption, as for instance, the Socinian, then manifestly the proposition is not intellectually true. That *an* idea of the Redemption may exist, and exist too in an intensely reverent mind without involving a belief in the divinity of

Christ, is proved by Coleridge's personal experience between the dates of his conversion to and his abandonment of Unitarianism.

It is, however, time to pause. Whether I shall be deemed to have established my point is a question upon which I will not venture to speculate; but those whom I may have failed to convince I should despair of convincing by further examination of the point. That Coleridge was a great writer on religious subjects no one in his senses would deny. That he had reflected profoundly on such subjects, and that he flashes light here and there upon their darkest recesses, is only an illustration of the wider truth that he was in the habit of reflecting profoundly on all subjects that came under his mental notice at all, and that he never failed to illuminate them in the same penetrating if fitful way. But that he was a great spiritual thinker, in the sense of a great religious philosopher, who so succeeded in connecting and co-ordinating the doctrines of theology with certain necessary metaphysical conceptions of the human mind as to enable, if not to compel, everybody who has once grasped the conceptions to accept the doctrines—this I cannot for a moment bring myself to admit. Nor do I see how the claim can be justified out of the published or bequeathed disquisitions of a writer who, while undertaking to build us a religion out of the materials of philosophy, is continually borrowing mortar from the theologian, and is occasionally compelled even to apply to him for bricks.

There is no difficulty in understanding the origin of that opposite conviction to which some contemporary writers—I do not here mean Principal Tulloch—have lately given such indignant expression. The growth of a "Coleridge legend" is easy enough to explain. Apart from Coleridge's fame as a poet, as a critic, as a discourser, as a writer of "impassioned prose," he possessed the additional attraction of a singular intellectual and spiritual history. A Unitarian who had gradually brought himself to embrace the whole body of Anglican doctrines, and even to become their energetic defender, was naturally an object of curiosity to Unitarians, and of sympathetic interest to Anglicans of what was afterwards called the Broad Church School. It is natural that men of this latter class, mistaking indirect intellectual stimulus—as so often happens—for direct dogmatic instruction, should have created and handed down a tradition of Coleridge as a teacher capable of doing entirely for other men what, in fact, he only partially did for themselves.

The most famous of these disciples, however, appears to me to have been prefigured in his master. Mr. Matthew Arnold has humorously described the late Mr. Maurice as "beating the bush with profound emotion, but never starting the hare." Coleridge beat more and thicker bushes than Mr. Maurice, and with emotion even more profound. But if he really did start the hare its flight has been so swift as altogether to elude my unpractised eye. H. D. TRAILL.



## IDEAS ABOUT INDIA.

### IV.—THE NATIVE STATES.

It was not my design when I began these essays to venture any opinion with regard to the semi-independent States of the empire. They were a subject indeed of great interest to me, but one on which I would rather have withheld my views until I had acquired a fuller and more general knowledge, for my personal experience last winter was practically limited to the single State of Hyderabad, and I had been compelled by want of time to forego projected visits to the Mahratta principalities, Baroda, Gwalior, or Indore, or to take more than a passing glance at those of Rajputana. Circumstances, however, within the last two months have turned public attention, both Indian and English, unexpectedly in the direction of the "native States," and there are signs in the air, or rather, I should say in the public press, which would seem to betoken that the Imperial policy towards some of the feudatory princes is about to assume a new shape of activity, so that I am tempted to go farther than I intended, and to add what I know about these princes and their relations with the empire to the rest of my Indian impressions.

Speaking generally, the interest attaching to the native States is twofold for the political observer. They present in the first place a picture, instructive if not entirely accurate, of the India of past days, and so serve in some measure as landmarks and records of the changes for good and evil our rule has caused. And, secondly, they afford indications of the real capacity for self-government possessed by the indigenous races. When one has seen a native court, with its old world etiquettes, its ordered official hierarchies, and its fixed notions, one learns something, which no amount of reading could teach, about the tradition of paternal government long swept away in Madras and Bengal. One recognises how much there was that was good in the past in the harmonious relations of governors and governed, in the personal connection of princes and peoples, in the tolerance which gave to each caste and creed its recognised position in the social family. One is surprised to find how naturally such adverse elements as the Hindu Brahmin and the Mohammedan nobleman lay down together under a system which precluded class rivalry, and how tolerant opinion was in all the practical details of life. One does not readily imagine from the mere teaching of history the reason which should place a Mussulman from Lucknow in command of the army of a Rajput prince, or a Hindu statesman in the position of vizier to a Nizam of the Deccan. Yet seeing, one understands these things, and one recog-

nises in them something of the natural law existing between "the creatures of the flood and field" which makes it impossible "their strife should last." In the traditional life of ancient India there was an astonishing tolerance now changed to intolerance, an astonishing order in face of occasional disorder, and a large material contentment which neither war nor the other insecurities of life permanently affected. It is impossible, too, after having visited a native court, to maintain that the Indian natives are incapable of indigenous government. The fact which proves the contrary exists too palpably before one's eyes. The late Sir Salar Jung was as distinctly a statesman as Lawrence or Dalhousie; and among the Mahrattas there are not a few diwans to be found in office capable of discharging almost any public function.

At the same time it is abundantly clear that in all that constitutes intellectual life the India of old days, as represented in the still independent States, was far more than a century behind the India of our day. Mental culture is at the lowest ebb in the capitals of the native princes. They possess neither schools on any large plan, nor public libraries, nor are books printed in them nor newspapers published. I was astonished to find how in the centre of busy intellectual India large flourishing towns were to be found completely isolated from all the world, absorbed in their own local affairs, and intellectually asleep. At certain of the native courts history is still represented by the reciter of oral traditions, letters by the court poet, and science by professors of astrology; while the general politics of the empire hardly affect, even in a remote degree, the mass of the unlettered citizens. Last winter's storm over Lord Ripon's internal policy left the native States absolutely unmoved. There is both good and bad in this.

With regard to their material prosperity, as contrasted with British India, I can only speak to what I have seen. The territories of the native princes are for the most part not the most fertile tracts of India; and one cannot avoid a suspicion that their comparative poverty has been the cause of their continued immunity from annexation. Nearly the whole of the rich irrigated ricelands of the peninsula are now British territory; and the estates of the Nizam, and the two great Mahratta princes Holkar and Scindia, comprise a large amount of untilled jungle. These countries possess no seaports or navigable rivers, and their arable tracts are not of the first order of productiveness, while the Rajput princes are lords of districts almost wholly desert. It would be therefore misleading to compare the material wealth of the peasantry in any of these States with those of Bengal or the rich lands of the Madras coast, for the conditions of life in them are not the same. But, poor land compared with poor land, I think the comparison would not be unfavourable

to the native States. I was certainly struck in passing from the British Deccan below Raichore into the Nizam's Deccan with certain signs of better conditions in the latter. Most of the Nizam's villages contain something in the shape of a stone house belonging to the head man. The flocks of goats, alone found in the Madras Presidency, are replaced by flocks of sheep; and one sees here and there a farmer superintending his labourers on horseback, a sight the British Deccan never shows. In the few villages of the Nizam which I entered I found at least this advantage over the others, that there was no debt, while I was assured that the mortality during the great Deccan famine was far less severe in the Nizam's than in Her Majesty's territory.

It must not, however, be supposed that in any of the native States the ancient economy of India has been preserved in its integrity. Free trade has not spared them more than the rest. Their traditional industries have equally been ruined, and they suffer equally from the salt monopoly; while in some of them the British system of assessing the land revenue at its utmost rate, and levying the taxes in coin, has been adopted to the advantage of the revenue and the disadvantage of the peasant. On the whole the agricultural condition of the Hyderabad territory seemed to me a little, a very little, better than that of its neighbour, the Madras Deccan, and I believe it is a fact that it is attracting immigrants from across the border. The Rajput State of Ulwar, where I also made some inquiries, was represented to me as being considerably more favourably assessed than British Rajputana.

The best-administered districts of India would seem to be those where a native prince has had the good fortune to secure the co-operation of a really good English assessor, allowing him to assess the land, not with a view to immediately increased revenue, but the true profit of the people. Such are to be found in some of the Rajput principalities, where the agricultural class is probably happier, though living on a poor soil, than in any other part of India; for the assessor, freed from the necessity which besets him in British territory of raising a larger revenue than the district can quite afford, and having no personal interest to serve by severity, allows his kinder instincts to prevail, and becomes—what he might be everywhere in India—a protector of the people. I trust that it is understood by this time that I am far from affirming that Englishmen are incapable of administering India to its profit. What I do say is that selfish interests and the interests of a selfish Government prevent them from so doing under the present system in British territory. Thus it is certain that the Berar province of Hyderabad under British administration has prospered exceedingly; and its prosperity affords precisely that exceptional instance which proves the general rule of impoverishment. But of this later. What may probably be affirmed without

any risk of error is, that the best-administered districts of the native States are also the best administered of all India.

With regard to the town population, I found the few independent native capitals which I visited exhibiting signs of well-being in the inhabitants absent in places of the same calibre under British rule. With the exception of Bombay, which is exceptionally flourishing, the native quarter, even in the Presidency towns, has everywhere in British India a squalid look. The "Black Town" of Madras reminds one disagreeably of Westminster and the Seven Dials: and there is extreme native misery concealed behind the grandeur of the European houses in Calcutta. The inland cities are decidedly in decay. Lucknow and Delhi, once such famous capitals, are shrunk to mere shadows of their former selves; and there is a distrustful attitude about their inhabitants which a stranger cannot fail to notice. The faces of the inhabitants everywhere in Northern India are those of men conscious of a presence hostile to them, as in a conquered city. In the capitals of the native States, on the contrary, there is nothing of all this, and the change in the aspect of the natives, as one passes from British to native rule, is most noticeable. The Hyderabadis especially have a well-fed look not commonly found in the inland towns, and are quite the best dressed of India. There is a bustle and cheerfulness about this city, and a fearless attitude in the crowd, which is a relief to the traveller after the submissive silence of the British populations. Elephants, camels, horsemen—all is movement and life in Hyderabad; and as one passes along one realises for the first time the idea of India as it was in the days when it was still the centre of the world's wealth and magnificence. That these gay externals may conceal a background of poverty is possible—English officials affirm that they do so; but at least it is better thus than that there should be no gaiety at all, nor other evidence of well-being than in the bungalows of a foreign cantonment.

Nor is the cause of the better condition far to seek. Whatever revenue the native court may raise from the people is spent amongst the people. The money does not leave the country, but circulates there; and even where the profusion is most irrational, something of the pleasure of the spending remains, and is shared in and enjoyed by all, even the poorest. In British India the *tamachas* of governors-general and lieutenant-governors interest no one but the aides-de-camp and their friends; and a large portion of the revenue goes clean away every year, to the profit of other lands and other peoples.

Of the administration of justice in the native States I had no opportunity of forming an accurate opinion, but I am willing to believe that it is less satisfactory in these than in British India. The only advantage that I could distinctly recognise in compensation was, what I have already mentioned, the absence of the Civil Courts,

which are so loudly complained of in the latter on account of the encouragement they give to usury. It is worth repeating that the only villages I found free from debt in India were in the Nizam's territory. With this exception, it is probable that British justice is better everywhere than "native" justice, and there is certainly not the same check exercised in a native State by public opinion over the doings of magistrates and judges. In all this the native States are far behind the Imperial system, for the despotic form of rule is the only one recognised in any of them, Hindu or Mohammedan, and there is no machinery by which official injustice can be inquired into or controlled. The ideas of liberty are spreading slowly in India, and the native States are hardly yet touched by them.

On the other hand, I do not hesitate to affirm that a vast amount of misrepresentation is at work with regard to the practical insecurity of life and property outside the area of British rule. Of all the native States Hyderabad has the worst reputation on this score, and before my visit to the Nizam's capital I was under the impression that I should find its streets paraded by gangs of armed cut-throats giving battle to each other when they met, and making all peaceful life a matter of chance. But these stories proved, on trial, to be the merest romance, and the tales repeated to-day have no reference to any modern state of things; and it is probably not once in five years now that a street scuffle of any importance between the retainers of the rival noblemen occurs in Hyderabad. These things used to be common thirty years ago, and the tradition of them has outlived the fact; but I believe it is not too much to say that, at the present time, the streets of Hyderabad present no greater dangers for peaceable persons than those of Cairo or Constantinople. Very few of the citizens any longer wear arms, and I found that my wife's maid was very well able to go out shopping on foot in the city, and even one day to visit the mosques, with no other escort than the Resident's butler, a Portuguese from Bombay. The dangers were imaginary ones, exaggerated, perhaps, for the political purpose of preventing communication between the Hyderabadis and non-official strangers. As actual difficulties of government, they had long ceased to have importance.

The same, too, may be said of the tales of highway robbery in the country districts which every now and then find their way into the Bombay and Calcutta newspapers, and are telegraphed to England under such titles as "Alarming increase of Dacoity in the Native States;" "Reported presence of armed bands in the Deccan;" "Dangerous state of the Hyderabad provinces," &c. These, like a vast majority of the telegrams from Egypt before the late war, are mere diplomatic fictions put out from time to time in the interest of political purposes. The true facts about Dacoity and Thuggi in the

Deccan I learned while at Hyderabad from the English officer in charge of that department; and I know that, while Thuggi has long been extinct, Dacoity has become so rare in the Deccan that the cases on which the officer was occupied had nearly all occurred many years before. The last case of an Englishman having been attacked by Dacoits in the Nizam's dominions was in 1863.

Exaggerated, too, for political purposes are, I believe, in great measure the apprehensions raised with respect to the native armies. Whatever may be the nominal number of the men under arms in the various States, I feel no hesitation in saying that it represents but a very small body of really efficient soldiers; and though, in the case of a new mutiny of the Imperial troops, Holkar or Scindia might be able to assert themselves as military powers, under other circumstances they would not be formidable. Of the Nizam's troops I had some means of judging on the occasion of the installation ceremonies, when the best regiments were paraded at Hyderabad, and they seemed to me very remote from military efficiency. The Arab troops of which so much is talked are few of them true Arabs, being, on the contrary, nearly all the descendants only of Arabs by women of the country, and are far from remarkable either for physique or energy; while some of the regiments seemed more worthy of service on the boards of a provincial theatre than on the theatre of any serious war. It is, however, I believe, an object with the military authorities in India to keep up an impression of the force of these armies, so as to justify the existence of the British forces designed to hold them in check. The motive is a natural, and, from a purely military point of view, a laudable one, but it is one that the civil authorities would do well to take account of. At the same time I am far from being, on principle, in favour of the native armies. They are an anomaly in the Imperial system, and might, under certain circumstances, become a danger. But I look upon the whole question of their recent increase and proposed reduction as one dependent on the loyalty quite as much of the Calcutta Government as of the princes themselves. As long as the Calcutta Government pursues its present policy of aggression on the native States, so long will these have every justification if they perfect the discipline of their forces and increase their armaments. Not indeed that they intend to wage even defensive war against the Imperial Government, but with the object of maintaining order so absolute and beyond question in their territories that no excuse may be given, for Imperial interference. Were it possible once thoroughly to reassure them on this point, I am of opinion that the princes themselves would not be unwilling to disarm; but with the fear of organised aggression before their eyes it is idle to expect another conduct from them. Such, in any case, was a view I heard expressed by certain high personages connected with the

Nizam's court, and I should be surprised to find that any other was entertained by the Mahratta princes, Holkar and Scindia. Those ancient rivals are no longer the enemies they were to each other twenty years ago, and they have abandoned any design they may once have had of flying at each other's throats. "Defence, not defiance," is, I feel sure, their motto and the explanation of any military energy they may be displaying.

That the policy of the Calcutta Foreign Office is really one of organised aggression with a view to annexation no one who has been at all behind the scenes for the last ten years can affect to doubt. Individual viceroys may be entirely opposed to such schemes, but the Foreign Office holds its own against the best of them; and the policy of aggression continues, intermittently perhaps, but surely, in British India just as in Central Asia by the Russians. It is the work of the official body, civil and military, who see in every addition of territory a new field for their energy and a new opening for promotion, employment, and pay. Thus the native States are not allowed to rest, or the princes to feel that confidence in the Imperial Government and sense of security which alone could divert their attention wholly from their defences. The history of systematic official encroachment in India, if it could be told in all its details by publishing the Calcutta Foreign Office records, would be one of the most scandalous the diplomatic annals of any country could show. The full record is, I fancy, never laid bare even to the most belligerent viceroy, and the general public of course only here and there catch glimpses of its action. Still, enough is known outside the official world to make it no hazardous assertion that such is the case; and in my own instance I am enabled to speak with more certainty on the ground of facts which at Hyderabad came within my own cognisance. Nor do I think that I can do better, with the object of setting the question of the native States in its true light, than by giving a short account of the history of this particular one, and of the more recent development of the Imperial policy towards it.

The Hyderabad State is the remnant, much reduced, of the old viceroyalty of the Deccan. Declared an independent principality in 1724 it became during the latter half of the last century the scene of rival intrigues between the French and English commercial companies, and only came definitively under British protection in the year 1800. At that date one of the old leonine treaties was made by Lord Wellesley with the Nizam, in virtue of which a force of the East India Company's troops was quartered on the country at the country's expense. The internal affairs of the State were shortly after, and in defiance of the treaty which had guaranteed the absolute independence of the Nizam, put under the management of a British Resident, whose orders seem to have been precisely what Sir Evelyn

Baring's have been for the last year at Cairo, that is to say, to assume the whole management of the Government, while repudiating all responsibility for results. Nor were these at Hyderabad at all different from those we are witnessing in Egypt. Unable to find honest men willing to accept the position of mere tools in his hands for the Company's profit, the Resident was constantly reduced to employing native agents the worst and least scrupulous the country afforded. Peculation and disorder of every kind were tolerated on the sole condition of loyalty to the Company's interests; places for Englishmen were multiplied; fortunes were accumulated; and the Resident himself, corrupted by the atmosphere of vice he had encouraged, ended by sharing the general demoralization. The Nizam on his side, reduced to impotence, and deprived of consideration, power or responsibility, retired from the scene in dudgeon to his palace, whence for many years he hardly issued, and where he spent his days ingloriously in such pleasures as his wealth afforded. If he reappeared at all in public, it was in connection with some intrigue which still further condemned him; and thus, infected like a caged leopard with the moral sores of captivity and inaction, he dozed his life away. Fifty years of this *régime* completed the ruin of Hyderabad politically, morally, and financially, and prepared the way for that last act of all Indian political dramas, the annexation of the State.

The then Resident, Colonel Low, writing officially to Calcutta, thus describes the financial position in 1853. "The pecuniary affairs," he writes, "of this Government are in a worse condition now than they have ever been since the treaty of 1800. The Nizam then had large private treasures, and the amount of his debt was trifling. His Highness's treasures have been since almost entirely exhausted. The debt now amounts to three and a half crores, a large portion of which consists of arrears of pay long due to troops and other public servants, who cannot be discharged for want of ready money wherewith to pay them off. Another large portion of the debt is due to *sahukars*, which is running at a ruinous rate of interest; and upwards of forty-two lakhs are due to the British Government. The whole revenue of this State amounts to about a crore and fifty lakhs; and as public credit is altogether unknown, a debt of that magnitude, with heavy interest accruing on it, presses most severely upon the Government, and causes a great ramification of evils throughout the country, the nature of which is too well known to render it of any use that I should expatiate on them."

The fact is, the whole country was in confusion. Besides two armies under English control, each noble kept a separate armed force, and faction fights were common even in the streets of Hyderabad. Dacoity, or highway robbery by armed bands exceeding forty men,



was prevalent in the country districts. The State was in debt to the Arab chiefs, who claimed on that account immunity for their followers when they chose to disturb the peace. The courts of law were most corrupt, the collection of the revenue most irregular, and all the while the British Resident, though master of the forces of the State, looked on, lamenting officially, from time to time, the evil, and pleading his utter inability to control it. The third act of the drama, the annexation of the country, seemed to have begun for Hyderabad when in the year already mentioned—1853—the East India Company seized Berar, the richest of the Nizam's provinces, for a debt due in connection with the pay of a second British army which had been quartered uselessly for fifty years upon the country, and claimed to hold and administer the same as material guarantee for future payments. Indeed, it can hardly be doubted that with Lord Dalhousie at Calcutta the end was then very near. Native misgovernment was the excuse everywhere for annexation, and what State was worse governed than Hyderabad? Two circumstances, however, prevented this consummation, and made the recovery of the ruined State possible. The first was the accession, unsuspected at the time, of a native statesman of real genius to power; the second, the outbreak of the Sepoy Mutiny.

Salar Jung, the scion of an old noble family of Arabian descent for many generations in the service of the Nizams, was appointed diwan, or minister, in the year following the climax of Hyderabad's misfortunes—the seizure of Berar. He was only twenty-four years of age, and his appointment seems to have been made originally as that of a supple tool of the Company's policy. He was, in fact, large enough in his ideas to understand that English rule, with all its strength of organisation and superior knowledge, must prevail against the spasmodic efforts of ignorant and disunited populations, and he honestly admired the qualities in Englishmen which had given them their power of command. This sympathy, which was unaffected, served as a cloak to his patriotism, a sentiment still deeper with him and more persistent than the other, and stood him in good stead when in the first years of his administration the Mutiny broke out, and he found himself for the first time in a position of real power towards the Company's servants. Then, instead of joining in the rebellion, as the majority of the Hyderabad nobles urged him to do, he held it stoutly in check, and to such good effect that from first to last no serious outbreak occurred in the Nizam's country against the English. This loyal action gained him, on the conclusion of peace, Lord Canning's recognition and well-deserved English gratitude. It was admitted that the friendly attitude of the Deccan State had turned the balance of strength in favour of our forces, and Salar Jung's name became one high in honour both at Calcutta and in

London. This was the minister's opportunity. Finding himself secure now of support from England (for the policy of annexation was discarded with the transfer of power from the Company), he threw all his energy into the task of reorganising the Hyderabad Government, restoring the finances, and, as the ultimate ambition of his life, winning back out of pawn the mortgaged province of Berar.

It was a noble ambition, and one in which, all but the crowning result, he lived to achieve. At the end of twenty years it would have been difficult to recognise the Hyderabad State, reorganised under Salar Jung's management, as the same State described so pitifully by Colonel Low. Order throughout had been restored; Dacoity had ceased to exist; the trained bands of the nobles had been reduced; the native army had been disciplined; the administration of the law had been reformed; the taxation had been made regular; and what is most of all astonishing, the finances had recovered their elasticity, and in place of debt the State treasury was in a position to show a large balance of ready money in hand. Hyderabad in a single generation, and by the efforts of a single man of genius, had cast off the slough of its captivity, and appeared now before the world not only a decent and well-governed, but even a model native State. English ideas in the meanwhile, and English interests, had lost nothing in the process; and it may safely be affirmed that never had the Imperial influence been so strong in the Nizam's dominion as under Salar Jung's undivided management. Who would have thought that anything but an increasing meed of honour would be the English reward for so sublime a life?

Such, however, was not to be the end of Salar Jung's career. The memory of the Mutiny and of the causes which produced it, having grown cold with Anglo-Indians, a recrudescence about ten years ago of the old aggressive policy began which has since grown in volume, and which is now displaying itself in various ways, and notably in the cry of the day against the native armaments. Its first manifestation was, if I am not mistaken, the affair of Baroda, in which Lord Northbrook played so characteristically into the official hands, and which by its success gave courage to the party of action, and prepared the way for still more vigorous developments under his successors. Its occasion in Hyderabad was this. In 1872 Salar Jung having reconstituted the State finances, and with a sufficient balance of ready money in hand, thought to crown the success of his administration by obtaining from the Indian Government the retrocession of Berar. In point of law it would seem he was wholly in his right, the cession having been made distinctly as a guarantee for sums he now was ready to deposit in cash at Calcutta. But the Indian Foreign Office had never contemplated any such possibility, and

had come during its nineteen years of occupation to look upon the province as entirely and forever its own. A purely British administration had been introduced there, and as the surplus revenue of Berar went by agreement to the Nizam's, not to the Imperial coffers, it had been very lightly taxed, and so had prospered exceedingly. At the same time it had become a farm for the Anglo-Indian administration, which provided its members with some sixty highly paid places for the civil service, and formed an important field for their energy, promotion, and emoluments. This doubtless was the real crux of the situation; and, pleading the extreme hardship there would be to the inhabitants of the province were they deprived of direct British rule, the claim for its retrocession was indignantly refused. The official body, however, recognising the legal weakness of their position, were not a little alarmed, and the feeling was increased when Salar Jung shortly afterwards paid his visit to Europe. It was thought, rightly or wrongly, that the Minister on that occasion appealed from the decision of the India Office to certain high personages in London, and it was feared that he might make further appeals to the English public, which, such was his popularity, would probably have supported him. It became, therefore, a matter of policy at Calcutta to diminish Salar Jung's influence both at home and abroad; and according to Indian official tradition, no scruple was allowed to stand in the way of its accomplishment. Salar Jung was suddenly, therefore, about the year 1877, found in official circles to be disloyal. He was in league, it was whispered, with the enemies of British rule—with the Afghans, the Wahhabis, the Russians. The semi-official press in India received the hint, and the news was repeated even in England. The Resident meanwhile at Hyderabad was busy in undermining the Minister's position there.

There are at Hyderabad two parties among the nobles, their Whigs and Tories, and it was not difficult to intrigue. Salar Jung represented the party of progress, of education, of modern thought, and liberal ideas. It was discovered that all these innovations were hateful to the people, and the Resident suavely represented to the Indian Government, who represented it to the India Office, that the Minister was become unpopular in the State. The Emir-el-Kebir, his rival, chief of the old-fashioned party, which in truth in Hyderabad was the party of all the vices, it was affirmed represented the real wishes of the country. It was not the place of the Imperial Government to impose an unpopular policy or support any longer an unpopular Minister. Salar Jung, therefore, was to have a partner in the administration, and that partner was to be none other than the Emir-el-Kebir. This was the thin end of the wedge, the lever by which the Resident was to regain his full authority; and to a great extent the plan succeeded. During the last few years of his life the Minister

was constantly thwarted, threatened, and hindered in his work of reform by a colleague enjoying the Residency's support; and though he battled bravely, and constantly scored points of advantage, he yet as constantly lost ground. On one occasion the Residency even went the length of planning his arrest and deportation from the country, and only an accident prevented this last indignity from being put in practice. It is necessary to understand that the Calcutta Foreign Office is even more absolutely without moral scruple than our own.

This was the state of things in Hyderabad when Lord Ripon came to India, and what follows is proof of the extreme difficulty with which even the most honourable viceroy can fulfil his duties when opposed by the organised official will. Lord Ripon's first act was to send for Salar Jung to make him what amends he could for past indignities and to promise him full support for the future. He was to be henceforth sole and supreme in authority till his young master, the Nizam, should come of age, and then hopes were held out that as the final reward of all his services he should have the satisfaction of seeing the Berar province restored to its lawful owner. Salar Jung came back to Hyderabad a happy man, and set himself with new vigour to deserve such high confidence. But the Viceroy's honour was the last he was to receive at any man's hands. On the 8th of February, 1883, and within a year of the date of the Nizam's majority, the great Minister suddenly died.

I do not wish to appear in the light of any man's accuser in so grave a matter, but I am obliged to record a distinct impression from all that I heard at Hyderabad, and I cross-questioned persons well-qualified to speak, that this was not a natural death. It was said to be due to cholera, but the symptoms were not those of cholera, and the collapse was too sudden and rapid to be easily attributable to any other natural disease. The English doctors called in only saw the patient in the last stage of his suffering, and they differed in their opinions, the one maintaining the cause to be cholera, the other demurring to this. Yet no inquest was made after death, and the doubt was put to no test. On the other hand, there was every reason in the state of political parties at Hyderabad to make foul play probable. The traditional knowledge of poisoning, and what is doubtless the same thing under another name, witchcraft, is still extant among the old-fashioned families of the Deccan, and it was just these families who were most interested in the Minister's removal. The Residency intrigue was not the only one going on in the country, and Salar Jung's unpopularity was quite real as far as evildoers were concerned. In any case the Minister's enemies were the persons who profited directly by his death; and this alone would justify suspicion. Neither, if foul play indeed there was, is it easy to acquit the Residency of all blame in the matter. The Residency for years past had given its

countenance to the worst elements in Hyderabad political life, and Salar Jung's enemies must have known that his death would not be very gravely regretted at Calcutta. They may well have felt secure from vindictive pursuit; and the recent example of Egypt proves how readily the official encouragement of the bad element against the good in Oriental society generates crime. It is not with impunity that a power like England can give its political countenance to unscrupulous men.

Be this, however, as it may, Salar Jung died for all evil purposes in the nick of time; and the accident of his death was seized upon by the Calcutta Foreign Office at once for the most vigorous action yet taken against the Hyderabad State. Under cover of the respectable name of an old Hindu nobleman, the Peshkar, who had been Salar Jung's friend but was now in his senility, the party of reaction was put in full power and given a free rein to do what harm it pleased, without let or hindrance from the Resident, financially, politically, and in the business of administration. When I arrived at Hyderabad at the close of 1883, I found all Government business at a standstill, the employ es unpaid, Salar Jung's trained administrators being dismissed, and a general scramble going on at the expense of the treasury both by Englishmen and natives. Laik Ali, Salar Jung's eldest son, a young man of great promise and imbued with his father's ideas, had indeed been given a place in the Government, but he was carefully excluded from any real power, and could only lament impotently the ruin of the State and the triumph of his father's enemies.

Nor was this by any means all. A truly infamous policy, worthy of the very worst traditions of the East India Company, was being pursued towards the young Nizam. As long as the great Minister was alive no pains were spared to keep the Prince from those temptations which had been the ruin of his predecessors—the corruption of a life of pleasure and the sloth of the zenana. Now he was being encouraged in the ways of vice by men who saw in his ruin the most certain means for them of retaining power. I spare readers the details of what I learned on this head, for it is a history as disgraceful as any in Indian annals; but the facts are beyond dispute, and the only doubt there can be is as to how far the Calcutta Foreign Office were responsible for the state of things they most certainly knew of. On this last point, though I refused at first to suppose it possible, there is, nevertheless, ample proof in the fact, to which I can vouch on my personal testimony, that no effort was being spared either at Hyderabad or at head-quarters to prolong the situation. The one object of every official with whom I conversed on the subject was to put off the majority of the Nizam, for another two years, to keep things as they were, and to prevent Lord Ripon from inquiring personally into matters. While at Hyderabad I did not refrain from

speaking to the Resident, Mr. Cordery, himself on the subject, and afterwards with the Calcutta officials, and their language to me was, that they regretted the state of things, but that they had no choice but to support the present arrangement; that the Nizam was too young to be released from tutelage; and that Laik Ali would do far better by making friends with the new régime than by standing out against it. A "waiting game," I was assured, was his only policy. Yet, what did that waiting game mean, except the financial ruin of the State and the moral ruin of its master?

Fortunately Laik Ali did not wait. Plucking up courage, he appealed to Lord Ripon; and Lord Ripon, to the horror of the official world, resolved himself to go to Hyderabad, where, having won the young Nizam's confidence, he speedily learned the truth. To the last prodigious efforts were made to throw dust in the Viceroy's eyes, the details of which were some of them most amusing. There was a scare of cholera raised, and the Viceroy's camp was fixed twelve miles from the city. It was given out that the Viceroy wished to see no one, and a kind of quarantine cordon was established. The camp itself was put in the enemy's keeping, and intimidation was to my knowledge used to prevent the Nizam speaking all his mind. A huge bodyguard of officials surrounded the Viceroy day and night, and to the last moment all the world believed that the Residency had triumphed. It seemed incredible that a single man, Governor-General though he was, should dare persist in an act of justice condemned by every counsellor. Yet this is what Lord Ripon did, and events have fully justified him.

The last scene of the drama was one of the most striking—I may say also the most touching—I ever witnessed. On the morning of the Nizam's installation, which the Viceroy persisted should be at once, it was not even yet known who was to be minister; and it was only when the poor Peshkar, the stalking-horse of the intrigue, found his seat by the throne occupied, and young Laik Ali there wearing a yellow turban, the Nizam's colour for the day, that it was understood that indeed right for once had triumphed over wrong, and that the Hyderabad State was saved. It was a moment to remember as long as one lived, and I shall never forget the feelings with which I listened to the Viceroy's speech—I might have called it a sermon—to the young prince whom he had just placed on the Musnad. It affected many besides myself, and even the official world for the moment bowed to the superior power of virtue.

Nor was this a transitory victory only. A few days later the Nizam publicly announced to the world his intention of adopting a different life from any his predecessors had lived. He left his *zenana* in the city, and taking up his residence with a single wife in a smaller palace outside, set himself to acquire the arts of government in earnest;

and as I see that his young Minister, Laik Ali, is now Sir Salar Jung, and that the Nizam himself is about to receive the Star of India from Lord Ripon's successor, we may feel some confidence that the intention has been kept. Occasional reports of the old sort come, indeed, from Hyderabad, but we may be pretty sure that these are only the final splutter of last year's conflagration, and that if Lord Dufferin continues in Lord Ripon's footsteps no more real trouble need be recorded in the Deccan. One thing, however, the official world has gained, and this, I suppose, has helped them to accept their defeat cheerfully. The Berar province, in spite of Lord Ripon, remains, with its sixty paid places, in their hands, the prize for which they fought.

The moral of this tale—which I beg honest English readers to believe I have not exaggerated, for I have omitted the most scandalous details—is this. The native States, with their “excessive armaments,” their “hotbeds of intrigue,” and their “disloyalty,” if they are lions in the Imperial path, have become so by our own misconduct, and will so remain until we change our methods. Hyderabad a year ago was probably the most disloyal town in India; now it is probably the most loyal, and all through a little honest dealing and a little viceregal sympathy. The truth is, honesty in the Indian “political department” is a thing enormously wanted; and I will venture to say that if that powerful body will only mend its ways, and treat the native States on the same moral principles of straightforwardness and respect for right which each member of the Department doubtless acknowledges in his own private life, we shall hear no more of disloyalty, and the work of disarmament, if it be required, will be one voluntarily accomplished. Till then, however, we must expect storms—and storms, alas! are the element on which the Anglo-Indian thrives. Still, let us hope for the best.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

P.S.—Since the above was written Lord Ripon's farewell progress through India, with its wonderful demonstrations of native loyalty, seems to have opened English eyes at last to the value of his ideas of rule. Nothing in them was more remarkable than his treatment of the native princes; and the spectacle of Holkar travelling to Bombay to press his hand for the last time must have convinced even his worst enemies that there was something advantageous for the Empire in the confidence and affection the departing Viceroy inspired. We may hope, therefore, that his successor will take the lesson to heart, and that he will accept it as the axiom of his diplomatic dealings with the native States that an honest course, guileless of all intrigue, is the only safe one in these troublous times. The end of regaining native loyalty is a high one, and Lord Ripon's example is there; and Lord Dufferin is both forewarned and forearmed.

## SCIENTIFIC *VERSUS* BUCOLIC VIVISECTION.\*

To judge from appearances, we are threatened with a new agitation against vivisection. The recent controversy carried on in the columns of the *Times* revealed an amount of heat on the subject which can hardly fail to find some new mode of motion on the platform, or even in Parliament. It is evident that passions of no common fervour have been kindled, at least, in one party to the controversy, and efforts will probably be made to work the public mind up to a similar temperature. The few observations which follow are intended to have, if possible, a contrary effect. The question of vivisection should not be beyond the possibility of a rational discussion. When antagonism, so fierce and uncompromising, exists as in the present case, the presumption is that the disputants argue from incompatible principles. Neither side convinces or even seriously discomposes the other, because they are not agreed as to the ultimate criteria of the debate.

It is evident that the first and most important point to be decided, is: "What is the just and moral attitude of man towards the lower animals?" or to put the question in another form: "What are the rights of animals as against man?" Till these questions are answered with some approach to definiteness, we clearly shall float about in vague generalities. Formerly, animals had no rights; they have very few now in some parts of the East. Man exercised his power and cruelty upon them with little or no blame from the mass of his fellows. The improved sentiment in this respect is one of the best proofs of progress that we have to show. Cruelty to animals is not only punished by law, but reprobated, we may believe—in spite of occasional brutalities—by general public opinion. The point on which precision is required is, how far this reformed sentiment is to extend? Does it allow us to use animals (even to the extent of eating them) for our own purposes, on the condition of treating them well on the whole, of not inflicting upon them unnecessary pain; or should it logically lead to complete abstention from meddling with them at all, from interfering with their liberty, from making them work for us, and supplying by their bodies a chief article of our food? Only the extreme sect of vegetarians maintains this latter view, and with vegetarians we are not for the moment concerned; and I am not aware that even vegetarians oppose the labour of animals for the uses of man. Now, what I would wish to point out is, that if we do allow the use of animals by man, it is a practical impossibility to prevent the occasional, or even the frequent



infliction of great pain and suffering upon them, at times amounting to cruelty; that if the infliction of cruelty is a valid argument against the practice of vivisection, it is a valid argument against a number of other practices, which nevertheless go unchallenged. The general public has a right to ask the opponents of vivisection why they are so peremptory in denouncing one, and relatively a small form of cruelty, while they are silent and passive in reference to other and much more common forms. We want to know the reason of what appears a very great and palpable inconsistency. We could understand people who said, "You have no more right to enslave, kill, and eat animals than men; *a fortiori*, you may not vivisect them." But it is not easy to see how those who do not object, apparently, to the numberless cruel usages to which the domesticated animals are inevitably subjected by our enslavement of them, yet pass these all by and fix their eyes exclusively on one minute form of cruelty, singling that out for exclusive obloquy and reprobation. Miss Cobbe (*Times*, Jan. 6) says, "The whole practice (of vivisection) starts from a wrong view of the use of the lower animals, and of their relations to us." That may be very true, but I question if Miss Cobbe has sufficiently considered the number of "practices" which her principles should lead her to pronounce as equally starting from a wrong view of the use of the lower animals, and of their relation to us.

It is clear that the anti-vivisectionists are resolute in refusing the challenge repeatedly made to them, either to denounce the cruelties of sport or to hold their peace about the cruelties of vivisection. One sees the shrewdness but hardly the consistency or the courage of their policy in this respect. Sport is a time-honoured institution, the amusement of the "fine old English gentleman," most respectable, conservative, and connected with the landed interest; hostility to it shows that you are a low radical fellow, quite remote from the feeling of good society. Sport is therefore let alone. The lingering agony and death of the wounded birds, the anguish of the coursed hare, the misery of the hunted fox, even when not aggravated by the veritable *auto da fé* of smoking or burning him out if he has taken to earth, the abominable cruelty of rabbit traps; these forms of cruelty and "torture," inasmuch as their sole object is the amusement of our idle classes, do not move the indignant compassion of the anti-vivisectionist. The sportsman may steal a horse when the biologist may not look over a hedge. The constant cruelty to horses by ill-fitting harness, over-loading, and over-driving must distress every human mind. A tight collar which presses on the wind-pipe and makes breathing a repeated pain must in its daily and hourly accumulation produce an amount of suffering which few vivisectionists could equal if they tried. Look at the forelegs of cab horses, especially of the four-wheelers on night service, and mark

their knees "over," as it is called, which means seriously diseased joint, probably never moved without pain. The efforts of horses to keep their feet in "greasy" weather on the wood pavement are horrible to witness. To such a nervous animal as the horse the fear of falling is a very painful emotion; yet hundreds of omnibuses tear along at express speed every morning and evening, with loads which only the pluck of the animals enables them to draw, and not a step of the journey between the City and the West End is probably made without the presence of this painful emotion. Every day, in some part of the route, a horse falls. Then occurs one of the most repulsive incidents of the London streets, the gaping crowd of idlers, through which is heard the unfailing prescription to "sit on his head," promptly carried out by some officious rough, who has no scruples as to the "relations of the lower animals to us." Again, in war the sufferings and consumption of animals is simply frightful. Field-officers—some of whom, it appears, are opposed to vivisection—are generally rather proud, or they used to be, of having horses "shot under them." But this cannot occur without considerable torture to the horses. The number of camels which slipped and "split up" in the Afghan war has been variously stated between ten and fifteen thousand. In either case animal suffering must have been on a colossal scale. Now the point one would like to see cleared up is, why this almost boundless field of animal suffering is ignored and the relatively minute amount of it produced in the dissecting-rooms of biologists so loudly denounced.

But what I wish particularly to call attention to is the practice of vivisection as exercised by our graziers and breeders all over the country on tens of thousands of animals yearly, by an operation always involving great pain and occasional death. In a review intended for general circulation the operation I refer to cannot be described in detail, but every one will understand the allusion made. It is performed on horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, and fowls. With regard to the horses the object is to make them docile and manageable. The eminent Veterinary-Surgeon Youatt, in his book on the Horse (chap. xv.), speaks of it as often performed "with haste, carelessness, and brutality;" but even he is of opinion "that the old method of preventing hæmorrhage by temporary pressure of the vessels while they are scared with a hot iron *must not perhaps be abandoned.*" He objects strongly to a "practice of some farmers," who, by means of a ligature obtain their end, but "not until the animal has suffered sadly," and adds that inflammation and death frequently ensue.

With regard to cattle, sheep, and pigs, the object of the operation is to hasten growth, to increase size, and to improve the flavour of the meat. The mutton, beef, and pork on which we feed are, with

rare exceptions, the flesh of animals who have been submitted to the painful operation in question. In the case of the female pig the corresponding operation is particularly severe; while as to fowls, the pain inflicted was so excruciating in the opinion of an illustrious young physiologist, whom science still mourns, that he on principle abstained from eating the flesh of the capon.

Now there is no doubt that here we have vivisection in its most extensive and harsh form. More animals are subjected to it in one year than have been vivisected by biologists in half-a-century. It need not be said that anæsthetics are not used, and if they were or could be they would not assuage the suffering which follows the operation. It will surely be only prudent for the opponents of scientific vivisection to inform us why they are passive and silent with regard to bucolic vivisection. They declare that knowledge obtained by the torture of animals is impure, unholy, and vitiated at its source, and they reject it with many expressions of scorn. What do they say to their daily food which is obtained by the same means? They live by the results of vivisection on the largest scale—the food they eat—and they spend a good portion of their lives thus sustained in denouncing vivisection on the smallest scale because it only produces knowledge. It is true that they are not particular to conceal their suspicion that the knowledge claimed to be derived from vivisection is an imposture and a sham. Do they not, by the inconsistencies here briefly alluded to, their hostility to alleged knowledge, and their devotion to very substantial beef and mutton, the one and the other the products of vivisection, expose themselves to a suspicion better founded than that which they allow themselves to express? They question the value of vivisection, may not the single-mindedness of their hostility to it be questioned with better ground? Biology is now the frontier science exposed for obvious reasons to the *odium theologicum* in a marked degree. The havoc it has made among cherished religious opinions amply accounts for the dislike which it excites. But it is difficult to attack. On the other hand, an outcry that its methods are cruel, immoral, and revolting may serve as a useful diversion, and even give it a welcome check. The Puritans, it was remarked, objected to bear-baiting, not because it hurt the bear, but because it pleased the men. May we not say that vivisection is opposed, not because it is painful to animals, but because it tends to the advancement of science?

The question recurs, What is our proper relation to the lower animals? May we use them? If so, abuse and cruelty will inevitably occur. May we not use them? Then our civilisation and daily life must be revolutionised to a degree not suggested or easy to conceive.

JAS. COTTER MORISON.

## THE NAVY PARALYSED BY PAPER.

MUCH has been said and written of late as to the necessity of increasing the navy, so much, indeed, that the Government, though apparently somewhat loath to do so, have obtained from Parliament a considerable grant of money to be applied to this purpose. In the meantime, no consideration appears to have been given in any quarter to the antecedent and far more important question of what is to be done, in case of war, with our improved navy when we have got it. To forge at great cost a weapon of great perfection, and then to find, when the moment comes for using it, that it can in practice not be used at all, but must be laid up in an armoury as a splendid example of the skill of our hands, and the want of foresight of our heads, should be accounted an act of folly. Yet this act of folly is precisely what we are in course of perpetrating.

The use of a navy in time of war is to injure our enemy and to protect ourselves. I propose to show that, whatever the strength of our navy may be, it will, in consequence of certain modern rules of warfare, which we have adopted, and by which we are bound, be able to do neither the one nor the other; that, whatever may be the power of our vessels and the courage and ability of our men and officers, they will, while under these rules, have no power either of inflicting any serious injury on the enemy, or of affording any effectual protection to ourselves; that our navy will, in short, be precluded from putting that stress upon the enemy which shall exhaust him and shall force him to desire peace; and equally precluded from preventing such a stress being put upon ourselves. I must premise that I am speaking, not of a "little war" with small, remote, and savage peoples, but of a serious conflict with a European Power possessing a fleet and a commerce.

Injury to the enemy may be inflicted by a navy either by fighting and defeating his fleets; by landing expeditions on his shores (which, however, is military rather than naval action, the navy being only then on transport duty); by bombardment of his coast towns; by blockade of his ports; and by capturing his property and stopping his trade on the seas. Of these methods, the last is by far the most important, inasmuch as it is that which cuts off the enemy's resources at their springs and so puts the greatest stress upon him. Protection to ourselves is complete when all these things are prevented from being done to us; and the navy is then most truly efficient when it does most completely do all these things to the enemy and most completely prevents them from being done to ourselves. So far is this from being now the case that, except by meeting and fighting the

enemy's fleets (which, as will be shown, it would probably have no opportunity of doing) ; by bombarding his coast towns ; by blockading his ports (which, as will be shown, would now be to little or no purpose) ; or by landing expeditions on his shores, our navy could, under the existing rules of warfare, take no effectual part in the war either by injuring the enemy or by preventing the like injury to ourselves. The exceptions I have made appear at first sight to be large, but they are far less important than they seem to be ; for I shall, I think, be able to show that, in the case of such a war as is here contemplated, the British navy might defeat the enemy's fleet on a rare occasion, might bombard his coast towns, blockade his ports, and land expeditions on his shores without materially affecting the resources upon which he could rely for the continuance of the war. On the other hand, that same navy would be unable to protect our own resources of strength, so entirely unable that, before a cannon shot had been fired some of the most important of those resources would have disappeared for ever. One of the principal services which our navy would be expected to render in time of war is the protection of our over-sea trade, that is to say, of the bales of British goods shipped by our merchants, and of the British merchant-vessels in which they are carried. But under the new conditions of warfare the navy would have absolutely no part in this matter. It would not be needed to protect the bale of British merchandise, which would be otherwise protected ; it would not be able to protect the British merchant-vessels, for the British merchant-vessels would cease to exist.

It remains to make this position good. On the 16th April, 1856, the plenipotentiaries assembled at Paris to make the Treaty of Peace which followed the Crimean War, signed what is called the Declaration of Paris. This Declaration, after reciting that the laws of maritime warfare had long been the subject of disputes, and that it would consequently be advantageous to "establish a uniform doctrine," lays down four rules : "1. Privateering is and remains abolished ; 2. The neutral flag covers enemy's merchandise, except contraband of-war ; 3. Neutral merchandise, with the exception of contraband of war, is not liable to capture under the enemy's flag ; 4. Blockades, in order to be obligatory, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a sufficient force really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy." Of these rules the two last are old and true, the two first new and false ; and it is especially the second, declaring that the neutral flag shall cover the enemy's goods, which must effect the paralysis of our navy, and which we therefore have especially to consider. This rule, indeed, is the kernel of the whole matter, the one truly important rule to which all the rest are subsidiary, and to affirm which the Declaration was really made. It is here to be remarked that Lord Clarendon and Lord Cowley, the British plenipotentiaries who signed this Declaration on behalf of their sovereign, had, so far as is known, no

authority empowering them to sign it. It is recorded in the protocols, that they had produced in the sitting of the 25th Feb., 1856, their full power to make the Treaty of Peace between the Allies and Russia; but there is no record either of their having produced or of their being provided with power to make the Declaration. Lord Clarendon, indeed, soon after admitted in the House of Lords that he and his colleague had "not confined themselves within the strict limits of their instructions;" and Lord Cowley on being, after Lord Clarendon's death, challenged to relieve himself from the imputation of having acted in this matter *ultra vires* and without instructions at all, declined to say anything with regard to the matter. All we know is that the two plenipotentiaries did assume to alter to all time the then existing laws of maritime warfare, by signing this Declaration; and that the Declaration forms no part of the Treaty of Peace to which alone their power, so far as is known, extended. In addition to this, the Declaration itself is false and self-contradictory, since it lays down as a "uniform doctrine" that which it does not make uniform, but only obligatory on such Powers as accept it, and only on those Powers as towards each other. For the United States and Spain, which Powers refused to accept the new doctrines, privateering is to this day *not* abolished, and the neutral flag does *not* cover the enemy's merchandise; neither is privateering abolished or the neutral flag protective of enemy's merchandise even for the accepting Powers, as between any one of them and any one of the non-accepting Powers. These facts are here summarily mentioned only to show that the Declaration is in itself of such a character, and was made under such circumstances, as not only allow but invite its repudiation and abandonment—but always under proper conditions—by any Power that desires no longer to be bound by it.

Let us now examine the effect of that second rule with which we are principally concerned. Let us suppose (which God forbid) a war declared between England and France. Under this new rule of warfare, enemy's merchandise is safe from capture under a neutral flag; it is liable to capture under the belligerent flag. French merchandize, therefore, would be liable to capture and confiscation when shipped in a French merchant-vessel; it would be exempt from capture and confiscation when shipped in a merchant-vessel belonging to any neutral State. Likewise English merchandize would be liable in an English merchant-vessel, exempt when in a neutral merchant-vessel. The rule is not a rule founded on the nature of the thing itself; it does not allow capture as right, or prohibit it as wrong, because merchandize in its nature should or should not be capturable on the seas; it only says that when found in a particular kind of vessel it shall not be capturable. But its effect is to prevent all capture of all merchandize. On the first outbreak of a war, nay, on its first rumours, the French merchant would instantly abstain from employing French, the English merchant

from employing English merchant-vessels for the transport of their goods, for the simple and sufficient reason that in such vessels such goods would be liable to capture. To the neutral vessels, and to those alone, all English and French merchandize must instantly go, for in the neutral vessels it would be absolutely secure, and, as M. Hautefeuille truly says, "*le commerce vit de sécurité.*" Actual war would not be required to produce this result, the bare rumour of war would suffice. This is shown by the Report of the Select Committee on Merchant Shipping of 1862, wherein we are told:—"A short time ago, when it was thought England might be involved in the war between France and Austria in Italy, however improbable the rumour might be, yet the moment it reached distant ports such as Canton or Calcutta, a second-class American vessel was able to get freights at a fifty per cent. higher rate than a first-class British ship could obtain." Mr. Lindsay, too, in his letter to Lord Russell, of October 14th, 1859 (presented to the House of Commons in 1860), said:—"The apprehension of future hostilities has, in various instances, operated almost as prejudicially in depreciating the value of capital, and especially of shipping property, as if a war had actually been declared."

Under the old rule, always acted upon in the great wars in which England was concerned, these results could not occur; for under that rule the liability to capture attached to the merchandize itself, in whatever vessel found, and did not depend upon the nationality of the vessel in which it was carried. Under that rule, therefore, no such depreciation of freights or of the value of shipping property could ensue. Nor did it ensue; on the contrary, when England was at war, English vessels were then not less but more in favour for the carriage of English merchandize than any neutral vessel; for they were protected by the English navy from capture, which the neutral vessel was not and could not be. But the new rule being brought into play, there is, in case of the supposed war, (1) an end at once to the French and English carrying trade by French or English vessels; (2) a handing over at once of that carrying trade to the Germans, the Dutch, the Portuguese, the Spaniards, the Norwegians, the Italians, or any other nations that remained neutral; (3) the withdrawal under the neutral bunting of all French and English merchandize destined to be sent over the seas. English and French merchant-vessels alike must remain unemployed during the war. This means that of the 24,706 English merchant-vessels of 6,956,865 tons (manned by 200,727 men) employed in the home and foreign trade<sup>1</sup> all but a very few would be unable to get any work whatever. It also means that the 15,200 French merchant-vessels, of 983,017 tons, would be equally unable to get work. But inasmuch as the English tonnage is over seven times as great as that

(1) See Board of Trade Statistical Abstract for the principal and other foreign countries, 1872 to 1882.

of France, the immediate injury done to England by the operation of the new rule in this respect would be seven times as great as that done to France. Not a very encouraging balance against us with which to begin such a war.

Meantime, the neutrals would be unable with their own resources to meet the new and increased demand for carriage by sea made upon them. But the remedy would be simple. The English and French merchant-vessels, laid up and rotting, would be for sale on the easiest of terms, the neutral would buy them at a low price in order to take advantage of the new trade thus opened up to him, and with them would naturally go their crews, only too glad to find under the neutral flag that work they could no longer obtain under their own. Shipowners would be ruined, and the carrying trade would be gone, if not for ever, for many a long year; for even when the war had ended, it would be a long and difficult work to bring ships and men back again out of the new channels of trade into the old. Again, let it be observed that under the old rule none of this could or did happen. For the reasons already given, England then kept her carrying trade during a war, and not only kept but increased it. Admiral Sir William Parker tells us, in his Autobiography (vol. i. p. 395), that in 1810 "the merchant-ships of Great Britain carried most of the commerce of the world, and in spite of having to make head against numerous open enemies and the scarcely-veiled hostility of the United States—whose ports remained closed to British ships of war, though they did not declare war until 1812—England was yet able to keep down the enemies' vessels of war and privateers. The prosperity of the country was steadily on the increase. . . . Both imports and exports increased steadily while the war lasted . . . and the trade was carried on almost exclusively in English bottoms."

So much for the ships. Let us now turn to the merchandize. This is withdrawn on both sides from the war by being put under the neutral flag. What is manifest death to the shipowner appears therefore, at first sight, to be gain to the merchant. The gain, however, even to the merchant is more apparent and transitory than real and permanent. As Sir William Parker has shown us, the British merchant, so long as he has the protection of an efficient navy, does not require the protection of neutral bunting. And Sir William is borne out by the official statistics. In 1802, the year of peace, brought in by the Treaty of Amiens (from which the preliminaries were signed in October, 1801), the merchandize of the British merchant was represented by the following figures:—<sup>1</sup>

	Imports.	Exports.
Great Britain . . .	£25,615,041	£27,012,108
Ireland . . . . .	6,087,741	4,876,070
United Kingdom . .	<u>£31,702,782</u>	<u>£31,888,178</u>

(1) See *Commons Journals*, lviii., App. 800 and 957.



In 1803, the first year of the great war, it was represented by the following figures:—<sup>1</sup>

	Imports.	Exports.
Great Britain . . .	£21,646,968	£22,252,101
Ireland . . . . .	5,275,650	4,629,086
United Kingdom . .	<u>£26,922,618</u>	<u>£26,881,187</u>

In 1815, at the close of the war, it was represented by the following figures:—<sup>2</sup>

	Imports.	Exports.
Great Britain . . .	£35,987,582	£44,053,455
Ireland . . . . .	7,245,043	6,558,103
United Kingdom . .	<u>£43,232,625</u>	<u>£50,611,558</u>

showing an increase, during the year, of £16,310,007 in the annual imports, and of £23,730,371 in the annual exports of the United Kingdom.

These figures are pregnant with instruction. They show that, under the old rule, which permitted capture of enemy's goods even when found in neutral bottoms, the British merchant, far from decreasing, very greatly increased his trade in time of war, that, instead of suffering, he benefited.

During the twelve years of desperate warfare in every sea, from 1803 to 1815, the British merchant, being then under the old rule, and having no protection but the navy, so far from suffering for want of the protection afforded by the new rule, nearly doubled his exports of merchandize, while he also increased his imports by nearly one-half. This advance during twelve years of war is, it is needless to say, immeasurably greater than any that has been attained since, and especially greater than that attained during the last twelve years of uninterrupted peace now concluded; and this fact, if it stood alone, should make the merchant pause before he supports a rule which appears to save him at the cost of certain extinction for his fellow-citizen the shipowner. The truth is that the British merchant needs the protection of rules or of bunting less than any other in the world, for with Great Britain predominant at sea, the British merchant will always be able to carry on his trade under the wing of the same force which protected his grandfathers against the banded States of Europe without any rule of protection or any neutral bunting whatever. But even suppose the new rule-and-bunting protection to be as valuable and as necessary as some imagine, who look to their imagination rather than to history for their arguments—suppose this, and yet the question remains whether it is right or just, or even expedient for us as a nation, to protect the property of the merchant at the cost of the ships of the shipowner and of the destinies of the whole nation altogether. The life of the soldier and the sailor is

(1) See *Commons Journals*, lix., App. 584 and 608.

(2) *Ibid.*, lxxi., App. 801, and lxx., App. 709.

exposed, and, when needed, is taken; the purse of the general taxpayer is exposed, and, when taxes are needed, is emptied; the fortune of the war is at stake; nay, the very national existence is in peril; can it then be pretended that the merchant alone is to have a special protection for his bales which is not extended to the sailor or soldier for his life, to the taxpayer for his purse, or to the nation for its existence? Can it be asked that, alone of all things, the merchant's bales shall be withdrawn from the war and treated as though the war were not?

Nevertheless, there are merchants so selfish as to prefer the interest of the merchant before that of all the rest of the nation together, and so short-sighted as to grasp with avidity at the protection afforded to their bales by the new rule, not remembering the lesson that history teaches that this protection is not necessary, nor reflecting that even if it give them a temporary advantage in withdrawing their property from the incidence of the war, they of all men must in the end most suffer should the effect of that withdrawal be disastrous to the national powers of defence, or, what is the same, of offence. The remarkable feature about such defence of the new rule—apart from the merely selfish one—as has been adduced, is that it is always made to rest on the allegation that the rule which withdraws such merchandize from the incidence of war is “more civilised,” less “barbarous,” and “more humane” than the old rule which left it subject to the war. If any defenders of the rule on these grounds would condescend to explain how it can possibly be less “civilised,” more “barbarous,” or less “humane” to seize an enemy's property than it is to cut his throat, some importance might perhaps remain to their argument; but they have failed, and they ever must fail to do so. The mercantile community, however, is strong in Parliament, and up to this time it has contrived to bolster up the new rule that prescribes the cutting of throats instead of the capture of merchandize.

To return, however, to the effect of the new rule, and of the new state of things thereby created, upon the navy. In the case supposed of a war between England and France, the English navy would be absolutely unable to repeat in any way that action upon and extinction of the enemy's trade whereby France was once before exhausted and defeated. There would not be a capturable bale of French merchandize on the high seas. It would all be under the neutral flag, and therefore, by the new rule, protected. There would be none of those constant arrivals of prizes in our ports which were the daily occurrence of our last great wars. There would be no prize-money, and consequently no inducement to sailors (the most accessible of all men to the charms of money won by daring deeds) to come forward to man our fleets. There would also be no utility in blockades, effective or non-effective; for the French merchandize would be run across to the Belgian, the Dutch, the German, the Spanish, or the Italian

frontier, and there shipped in the rule-protected neutral vessel—a proceeding formerly of no avail, since it was the fact of the property being French, and therefore *res hostium*, that rendered it good prize, and not the incidental character of the vessel in which it was captured. Then as to naval engagements between the two fleets. There would be none unless it were by accident. Conscious of an inferiority, which could hardly fail to exist, in ships and men, the French fleets would remain in their ports, for the simple reason that they would have nothing to force them out to accept the risk of battle. What, indeed, under the new rule, *should* force them out? The object of raising a blockade? That would be unnecessary, since all the trade stopped by the blockade would now find its way into the protected neutral vessel over the frontier. To protect their merchant-vessels? There would be none to protect. To capture ~~English merchant~~ ships? There would be none to capture. To invade England, or, like Villeneuve, to lure away the English fleet in order to invade England? Even for this there would now be no such necessity as there was before the battle of Trafalgar, when indeed an invasion of England was so highly desirable to Napoleon, precisely because England was strangling France by killing her trade. But when England no longer kills trade, the desperate expedient of her invasion will not be pressed upon France. There would be an official war and a commercial peace, and from such a war it is not French but English trade that would most suffer.

Meantime our navy, reconstructed, powerful beyond all precedent, manned with heroic officers and men, burning to distinguish themselves, what influence would it, what could it have on the war? Practically none. The experience of the past shows us that the position of England is such, and such the natural aptitude of her sons, that, when real war is allowed to be made on the seas, sailors can contend with soldiers and fleets with armies. The Declaration of Paris by its second rule neutralizes the sea and renders real maritime warfare impossible. It withdraws therefore from England the field of action wherein she won her former successes, and wherein she still is and always must be predominant. For all other Powers, whose force is chiefly military, the result is unimportant, save when they may be at war with England, when it is advantageous; but for England, whose force is chiefly naval, it is manifestly most serious. There is no possibility indeed of doubting that it is at England, and at England alone, that the Declaration was aimed, to curb her and her alone that it was conceived. Europe knows well that the power of England at sea is no less now but far greater than ever it was; that steam and armour have given to the country that excels in all that relates to steam and armour an additional advantage; and the astute design has been formed and carried out of holding these hardy islanders in check not by force, but by a piece of paper.

Sailors are well aware of all that has here been said. But sailors fondly hope and confidently expect, that if ever England were to engage in a serious war, the Declaration of Paris would at once be repudiated. Those who so think delude themselves. Let them conceive themselves to be on the eve of the supposed war with France. The Germans, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Spaniards, the Portuguese, the Italians, are already counting the gains of that enormous English carrying trade, which, under the Declaration, we are pledged to leave for division amongst them, and some part of which, on the first rumours of the war, they have already obtained. Meantime the English Cabinet is looking anxiously over Europe for alliances, is coaxing, perhaps subsidizing, neutral powers to side with England. Is *that* the moment to turn round on these same neutrals and violently to withdraw from them the bribe (some of it already in their hand) which England has undertaken to give them in order to *prevent* them from allying themselves with England? What English Minister, actual or possible, would dare at such a moment, to propose such a theory? what House of Commons would support him in his proposal? Here in truth is one of the most serious points about this Declaration — that it at once prevents us from gaining allies, inasmuch as it pledges us to give our carrying trade to those Powers only which refrain from becoming our allies, or in other words which remain neutral; and at the same time deprives us of our power to carry on effectual war without allies; while it gives to every other Power in Europe a direct interest in resisting its abrogation.

No. If the Declaration of Paris is to be, as undoubtedly it should be, repudiated by England, English Ministers must not wait till we are on the eve of war, for it will then be at once too late to withdraw and dishonourable to do so. The falsehood of the Declaration in itself, its contradictions, its want of authority, and the effect it would have in paralysing the naval strength of England in any serious war, all cry loudly for its denunciation. But it must be denounced, if at all, and England must withdraw from it, if at all, in time of peace, so that all nations may have fair notice that if attacked, she means once more to use all the arms which nature has placed in her hands, and which the law of nations allows. Thus and thus alone will the navy of England be restored to its proper sphere of action, thus alone can England be enabled to feel secure because she is strong, thus alone can the question of increasing the strength of the navy become anything else than a question of idle parade. So long as the Declaration of Paris exists, and England is bound by it, the question whether we have a powerful navy which we cannot use, or a weak one which we cannot use, is comparatively idle.

THOMAS GIBSON BOWLES.

## JANE AUSTEN AT HOME.

THE letters of Jane Austen, which have recently been published by Mr. Bentley, were discovered by Lord Brabourne among other family papers after the death of his mother, Lady Knatchbull, who was Miss Austen's niece. The letters are interesting from the character of the writer, and from the allusions which they contain to her daily life and habits, and the neighbourhood in which she lived during the last seven years of her life. But they are addressed chiefly to her sister and her niece, and seldom travel out of the range of domestic topics, recording for the most part only the occupations and amusements—the birth, death, and marriage of her numerous circle of relations. They are full of the same humour and gentle smiling satire which we find in the novels, and by all who can appreciate these will be read with pleasure. But the flavour of Miss Austen's wit is rather delicate than rich, and by some it has been called insipid. So that some ninety letters, almost exclusively taken up with ribbons, flounces, and caps, and the sayings and doings of a crowd of undistinguished persons in whom the public at large cannot be expected to take an interest, are hardly likely, even with the aid of Miss Austen's genius, to become generally popular. To the lady's genuine admirers, however, they need no recommendation. These will understand that the pettiest and most commonplace details of domestic life may become amusing in the hands of this incomparable writer; while the book at the same time has the wider interest which always attaches to the sight of heroes and heroines *en deshabille*, and occupied with those trifling objects which, though as important to most of them as they are to the rest of the world, are vulgarly supposed to be beneath their notice. But the public must look for no literary or social gossip in these epistles. They introduce us to no lions; they offer us no criticism, or next to none; and they leave us with the impression that Miss Austen was in no sense of the word a woman of letters, or absorbed very deeply in the literature of her own or any other country. There is not the faintest odour of the *salon* about her. She is just a simple-minded, well-bred English young lady, thoroughly satisfied with her lot in life, interested in all the amusements which are popular with her sex, fond of quiet, fond of shopping, fond of the theatre, and thoroughly familiar with all rural habits and occupations. "There are a prodigious lot of birds, they say, this year," she writes to a correspondent, "so that perhaps even I may kill a few." We are not, I suppose, to infer from this passage that Miss Austen ever did shoot a bird, or shoot at one. But she must have felt, at all

events, that there could be nothing very odd in her doing so. That beneath this unpretending exterior lay a depth of observation, a power of expression, and a quality of humour which have caused eminent critics to pronounce her second only to Shakespeare, was suspected by no one till her works appeared, and then was very slowly recognised.

Many of these letters were written in London at the house of her brother Henry, who lived at one time in Sloane Street, and at another in Henrietta Street, Covert Garden, near the bank in which he was a partner. Here we may study the life of the upper middle class as it was in London sixty years ago. The ladies still shop in Cranbourne Alley and Leicester Square; they dine at half-past four that they may be in good time to see the great Mr. Kean as Shylock; when they come home at night they have soup and wine-and-water, and then retire "to their holes." We are rather surprised to find no hint of Vauxhall on any of these occasions; but Jane went to all the picture galleries constantly on the look out for a portrait of Elizabeth Bennett, whom she expected to find in a yellow dress. In this particular search she was unsuccessful, but she did discover Mrs. Bingley, "dressed in a white gown with green ornaments, which convinces me of what I had always supposed, that green was a favourite colour with her." She amuses herself with supposing that Mr. Davey had too much "love, pride, and delicacy," to allow Elizabeth's picture to be exhibited. Her own characters were very real persons in her eyes; and she was fond of describing to her friends what were their respective destinies in after life. The majority of the letters were written while Jane Austen's home was at Chawton, and as it was during these years that two of her best novels, one of them, perhaps, her very best, were begun and completed, and as she must certainly have found some of the materials for them in her immediate neighbourhood, I hope my readers will share the interest which I took in visiting this haunted spot.

Miss Austen, with her mother and sister, came to reside at Chawton in the year 1809. Mrs. Austen was the widow of a clergyman, who had been vicar of Steventon, in Hampshire, and who died at Bath in 1805. They had all quitted Steventon in 1801, and after Mr. Austen's death spent some years at Southampton, before finally settling down again to cottage life. During this interval Miss Austen wrote nothing but the unfinished story of the *Watsons*. At Steventon she had composed *Northanger Abbey*, *Pride and Prejudice*, and *Sense and Sensibility*, though they were not published till 1811. The remainder were not designed and executed at Chawton.

This little Hampshire village is situated about a mile and a half to the south of Alton, on the road to Winchester, and is the property of Mr. Montagu Knight, the great-nephew of Miss Austen. His

grandfather was Jane's brother, Edward, who was adopted by his first cousin, the Mr. Knight of that day, and assumed his name and arms. The Knights were a very old family in Kent, who acquired the Chawton property by intermarriage with the Lewknors, about the end of the seventeenth or beginning of the eighteenth century. The house is a picturesque old building of the date of 1588, and contains many very interesting portraits by Lely and by Romney; among others, one of Edward Knight, attired in the high-collared tail-coat, voluminous cravat, nankeen shorts, and watch seals dangling from his fob, which was the habitual costume, we must remember, of all Jane Austen's heroes. His face, however, did not remind us of his sister. It is a shrewd and rather striking face; but not oval like the novelist's, and without any of her beaming good-humour.

Miss Austen was particularly careful not to draw her characters from the life, or even to reproduce traits which should lead her acquaintances into the temptation of guessing at the originals. Her own family know of no instance in which this rule has been violated, so that no traditions remain, either at Steventon or at Chawton, of the particular personages who might have suggested Tom Thorpe or Mr. Bennett, or Mr. Elton, or Mrs. Norris. But the scenes, the houses, and the classes of society which we find in her delightful stories are exactly those with which she was familiar at home; and it is impossible to walk through the village of Chawton without feeling that we are in the presence of old acquaintances to whom we were introduced in the pages of *Mansfield Park*, or *Emma*. The cottage in the village, otherwise called the White House, belonging to Sir Thomas Bertram, to which Mrs. Norris retired on the death of her husband, the vicar, what can it be but the identical cottage belonging to the owner of the "Great House" to which Miss Austen herself retired? and if not, there are one or two others still remaining in the village which would equally correspond to it. I have seen in Chawton House itself a room conspicuously resembling that "East room," formerly the schoolroom, which was given up to Fanny Price; while from the hall-door you would just catch that glimpse of "two ladies walking up from the Parsonage," which Fanny caught herself when she was flying from the rehearsal of Lover's Vows. Often and often has that path been trodden by the footsteps of Jane Austen herself; and the only personal reminiscence of her which seems to have been preserved is in connection with it. One of her surviving nieces still remembers the figure of Aunt Jane walking across "the Pasture," as it is called, from the village to the "great House," with her head a little on one side, and a small pillow or cushion pressed against it as if she was suffering from the toothache.

On the other side of Alton lie one or two other villages which bear

a family resemblance to Highbury. Holybourne even now is much what Highbury might have been in the days of Emma, and Froyle, a village nearer to Farnham, was, I am told, just such another. In Chawton itself, a place with not two hundred inhabitants, there were two houses of "gentle-folk," besides the Hall and the Parsonage. At Froyle there were as many, and at Holybourne there are still. There was in those days a particular grade of society, now all but extinct, which haunted these large villages and small country towns, and seemed somehow or other to be associated with the days of stage coaches and to have perished with the advent of the railways: families quite unconnected with "trade," with small but still sufficient incomes, who did nothing at all in life, and seemed to wish to do nothing. Mr. Woodhouse is just such a man; Mr. Bennett was another. They were not county gentlemen; they were not professional men; they were not necessarily sportsmen; if they farmed, it was only for amusement. They would have shuddered at the thought of speculating; they vegetated quietly on a fixed income, which they were careful not to imperil, and formed the main ingredient at those card parties and early supper parties which were the amusement of our grandfathers and grandmothers in those secluded spots, and which imparted a familiar flavour of sociability and gaiety to the country life of the period, which has now long ago departed from it. Then, too, there was the village club, which was held at the Crown at Highbury, of which Mr. Knightly and Mr. Weston were members, and who had never found out that the paper was dirty till Emma and Mrs. Weston pointed it out to them. Imagine a country squire of four to five thousand a year, with all the best company in the neighbourhood, meeting to play whist and drink port wine at the Dog and Gun, or the King's Arms, or any other village inn of similar calibre, at the present day!

The residents in the neighbourhood of Chawton have noticed the gradual disappearance of families of this type, and I have noticed it myself in many other parts of England. Civilisation has been too much for them, and they are gradually retiring before its advances like the otter and the badger.

Jane Austen's cottage stands at the south-west corner of the village, where the road turns off to Alresford, and is thought at some remote period to have been a posting-house. It is now divided into two parts, one used as a working man's club, the other occupied by Mr. Knight's coachman. It is a long low house, of which what were the dining-room and drawing-room are still nearly as they were; and we may people the former with the authoress and her little writing-desk, seated at a table by the window, without any effort of the imagination. The garden was evidently a large one; the flower garden separated from the kitchen garden by only a



grass walk, and some fine fir-trees and lime-trees offering a pleasant shelter in the summer-time. It is now all in disorder. Turnips and mangel-wurzel are grown by the enterprising coachman in the ground where Jane Austen perhaps cultivated roses and dahlias, and the whole place wears a forlorn and disconsolate appearance. The memory of its former occupant, however, invests it with a halo of its own, which no amount of squalor can dispel. Here are the trees and the walks and the hedges on which Jane Austen's eyes rested as the Elliots and the Musgroves, and the Eltons and the Bertrams grew beneath her hand. Here was the shady walk where she paced up and down maturing her plots and shaping her catastrophes. Here, in this very little room, were written *Emma*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Persuasion*, and here the great question was decided of the proper incomes to be allotted to Eleanor and Marian Dagmoor. He who cannot do the rest for himself and rehabilitate Jane Austen's house as it was during her living occupation of it, had better not visit it at all.

All the reading world is now at Miss Austen's feet, but till lately her public was a small one. The generous and humorous Scott, the critical and prejudiced Macaulay, Southey, Coleridge, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Holland, Sydney Smith, knew and appreciated her novels. But the popular taste had just been diverted into another channel by the author of *Waverley* himself, when they first began to appear, and it was not till the flood of enthusiasm excited by the great feudal and mediæval renaissance had begun to settle down that Jane Austen's characters reappeared, so to speak, above the waters, and assumed their natural place in the literary world. There is hardly any person nowadays under fifty years of age with any pretensions to culture or literary taste, who would not be ashamed to own that he or she had not read *Pride and Prejudice*, or *Emma*, and the growing popularity of these inimitable portraiture, owing nothing to either sensational incidents, or broadly comic caricatures, is one of the most hopeful literary symptoms of the present day. Miss Austen is the true mistress of what for lack of a better title we must still call genteel comedy, and had she lived in the beginning or middle of the last century, would, I am confident, have outstripped all competitors. *Emma* alone would have made the fortune of a theatre, and would still, had we the actors and actresses capable of exhibiting traits so delicately marked, yet at the same time so piquant and so peculiar.

If we turn to the dramatists of the Restoration, and after these again to the Colemans, and Cibbers, and Bickerstaffs, and Murphys of the Georgian era, where shall we find a single painter of character to compare with her? The Dorindas and Isabellas, the Lady Sullens and Lady Teazles, the Sir Gilbert Wrangles and Sir Pertinax Mc Sycophants, who still keep the stage, are daubs by the side of Harriet

Smith and her patroness, Mrs. Norris, Lady Bertram, Tom Thorpe, Mr. Bennett, or Mr. Collins. I have taken these names at random and could match them with a dozen others. Neither Goldsmith nor Sheridan holds the mirror up to nature like Miss Austen; their comedies are really farces, and their characters, when not buffoons, possess little or no individuality. Powers more akin to Jane Austen's are discernible in both Richardson and Fielding: and I have often thought that had she been a man, she could have drawn a better Lovelace than the one and a better Amelia than the other. But after all, if there is one writer in the English language, except the great master of all, who, had he laid out his strength upon fiction could have equalled her on her own ground, I am inclined to think there is but one, and that is Addison.

Miss Austen's part is to make us smile rather than to make us think, to show us the ridiculous side of wickedness and folly, of meanness, selfishness, pompousness, vanity, and egotism, rather than their darker aspects or more dangerous consequences. She is no great moralist. Her art is all in all to her. She never treats vice with levity; that would have been false to the character of the society she was depicting. But as little do we hear of anything in the shape of agony, remorse, or penitence, as the natural consequences of moral guilt. Adultery and seduction figure in her pages among other incidents of human life which cannot be altogether omitted if the drama is to faithfully represent it. But they are treated with just that amount of reprobation which the world in general, the respectable, decorous world in which Jane Austen moved, visit such offences. They are shocking and deplorable, and imply that the young people who are guilty of them must have been very badly brought up. But we are carried no farther. Lydia Bennett and Wickham are supposed to be as happy in their married life as if they had never done wrong before it. A similar lot is thought possible for Mrs. Rushworth and Henry Crawford. The authoress who is to draw a picture of society cannot go farther than society goes in these matters; and the grief of the Bertram family over the elopement of Maria always reminds us of the conventional sorrow, which, when the feelings are not deeply touched, it is proper to exhibit at a funeral, rather than of that heart-felt shame or horror which many other writers would have deemed the necessary effect of a sister or a daughter's fall.

Herein this lady shows her genuine dramatic genius. We have plenty of writers who make the world out to be a great deal worse than it is; others who represent the worldly consequences of wrongdoing as a great deal worse than they are. Miss Austen hits the happy mean. She takes society as she finds it, and turns neither to the right nor to the left for the sake of strained effects; extenuates nothing, exaggerates nothing; leaves her readers to point a moral.

for themselves if they are so minded, or to rest satisfied with the contemplation of an exquisite picture if their ideas soar no higher. Above all, she indulges in no asides or colloquies with the reader, makes use of no artifices to direct his attention to her meaning, and never for one single instant is guilty of the crime of preaching. Oh ! then, it will be said, Miss Austen has no moral purpose. No, certainly not ; and why should she have ? Why should she be burdened with a load which the greatest luminaries of literature have never carried ?

That a woman brought up as Jane Austen was brought up, and living the life that she did live both at Steventon and Chawton, should have risen to this conception of her art, is one of the most curious facts in connection with her. That she reflects only the prevailing tone of the society in which she moved is no bar to our surprise. The wonder is that she was never tempted to depart from it, if only to lighten the difficulty of exciting an interest in her stories. To have steered exactly between the two extremes of undue severity and undue licence ; to have caused us an uninterrupted amusement without ever descending to the grotesque ; to have been comic without being vulgar, and to have avoided extremes of every kind, without ever being dull or commonplace, is the praise of which Jane Austen is almost entitled to a monopoly. The narrow path on which all her stories move, the moderation of her pretensions, the ordinary material out of which her dramas are constructed, are a source of ceaseless admiration when we consider the effects which have been produced by them : and only add another to the many proofs which we possess that nothing is too mean for genius to convert into gold.

We learn from the biographer of Miss Austen that her favourite poet was Crabbe. She would naturally sympathise with a writer who drew his inspiration from the ordinary humanity which surrounded him, and found poetry under the coarsest and least romantic aspects of village life. Yet the eye with which Crabbe looked on society was very different indeed from that which Jane Austen turned upon it. Crabbe was in reality more akin to the authoress of *Adam Bede*, than to the authoress of *Mansfield Park*. He had all her seriousness of purpose, though without any particle of her humour : and his powers of versification, combined with the sincerity and novelty of his descriptions, secured him the place which he deservedly occupies in our literature. But the cheerful, easy view of life, which either avoids or is unconscious of its deeper problems and its worst miseries, was wholly foreign to the author of the *Tales of the Village*. He could not walk about among the poor without seeing that the real conditions of rural life, at all events in the eastern counties, were very different from what poets had described : and to borrow a celebrated and much-misunderstood expression,

Crabbe "resolved to be correct." That is, he determined to be true to nature, and to give the world a picture of rural existence unembellished by any of the fanciful ideas with which it had been customary to adorn it. Now, I doubt whether it was in Jane Austen's nature to have done this; whether her genius would have flowered freely under such conditions; and whether she could have fixed her mind for long together on what was not cheerful and comfortable. But to repeat what I have said already, herein lies her title to our homage. There are better materials for fiction of a highly interesting character among the very poor and the very rich, than among the intermediate classes. There is no word in the human vocabulary which lends itself so little to the purpose of imagination as "comfort." Yet in Miss Austen's stories, while we are most deeply interested and excited, we are always steeped in comfort. I should have said, that much as she might enjoy the literary excellence of Crabbe she would have shrunk from the realities which attend it; and that she had neither the intellectual nor the moral robustness to stomach such fare. She was not born to "rough it" in pursuit of subjects: either to climb the highest peaks, or explore the lowest depths of society. But of all that could be seen from the window of a quiet English country parsonage, the whole border land in which the middle and the upper classes melt into each other, she was a perfect mistress, and such a painter as we may never see again. In his portraiture of squires and clergymen Crabbe cannot be compared with her for a moment. Though a clergyman, he was but an outside observer of such types; but Miss Austen was to the manner born, free of the craft, and knew them to the backbone.

Where all are so good it is difficult to award the palm. But I cannot at all events accept Lord Brabourne's classification, who places Elizabeth Bennett first among the heroines, and Darcy among the heroes. It is unnecessary to add that he thinks *Pride and Prejudice* her best novel. If we understand his contention, it is that Elizabeth is the best heroine because she has the fewest faults; and he appears to be of opinion that Emma's love of match-making, self-confidence, and self-will ought necessarily to make her less interesting. To myself they make her all the more so. Her sauciness is her great charm, and the sparring between herself and Mr. Knightly is scarce, if at all, inferior to the scenes between Beatrice and Benedict. In the heroine of *Pride and Prejudice* there is a combination of sweetness and vivacity which is very captivating, but she lacks the individuality of Emma, and on this ground alone, if on no other, I must still place her higher than Elizabeth.

If we turn to the heroes, I cannot say of Darcy what Lord Brabourne says of Mr. Knightly: "I never could endure him." He is eminently disagreeable, and in my opinion ill-bred. He might have thought what he liked about Elizabeth's relations, but he ought

not to have said it to herself. Mr. Knightly, on the contrary, is always a gentleman. That he was sixteen years older than Emma was, in my opinion, rather in his favour than against him. If he lectured her he never lectured her pompously, and it is to be believed that a few such lectures before marriage would save a good many afterwards.

Lord Brabourne's criticism is interesting, and his judgment carries great weight; but the explanatory prefaces attached to each division of the correspondence are more valuable still, as they enable us to enter into the subject-matter of the letter, and to understand the allusions and the jokes as we never could have done without them. I have no doubt that I speak the sentiments of all Jane Austen's admirers when I say that we are greatly indebted to him.

I thought it a privilege to be allowed to visit the spot where these novels were composed, and to gaze on the very room in which the authoress sat and wrote, to walk in the garden where she walked, and in the church where she so often knelt. Her grave is not in Chawton churchyard, where her mother, who died in 1827, and her sister, who lived in Chawton Cottage till 1845, are both interred; for she was removed to Winchester for her health in May, 1817, and dying there in the following June, was buried in Winchester Cathedral, nearly opposite to the tomb of William of Wykeham. Her fame has made its way so slowly, and is even now so much less than her deserts, that Chawton is untrodden of pilgrims, and the hospitable owner of Chawton House is but little molested with inquirers. But while English society remains what it still is, with so much to remind us of what it once was, and while the manners of one generation melt so imperceptibly into those of another that the continuity hardly seems broken, so long will the interest in Jane Austen continue to strengthen and expand, till Chawton perhaps may even become nearly as well known as Selbourne, and visitors to the one never think of departing from the neighbourhood till they have also paid a visit to the other. A celebrity such as that of Abbotsford it is not possible that it should acquire. Scott wrote for the world, while Miss Austen could hardly be appreciated by any one not thoroughly English. Guizot, it is true, was among her admirers, and there are foreigners, of course, who know England as well as some Englishmen know the continent. But these are exceptions, and "Miss Austen's country" must be content with the admiration of those who can admire Miss Austen. It had not intended when I commenced this article to travel much beyond the local associations connected with her, but have been unconsciously led into a criticism which my enthusiasm for one who commanded the enthusiasm of so many better able to justify it, will, I hope, be permitted to excuse.

T. E. KEBBEL.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE struggle, in the distant Soudan, the weary suspense, and the misgiving that the blood which stains the African desert need never have been spilt at all; the latest dastardly and insane attempts of the dynamitards, reprobated as they are by the common voice of Europe, of America and of the entire world; these are the themes which, at the close of the month preoccupy the public mind, to the temporary exclusion of all other topics. It is needless here to dwell at length upon the stirring events of which the region about Khartoum has been the theatre. What practical result are they to yield? When Lord Wolseley has finally defeated the Mahdi and rescued Gordon, what is the responsibility which we have to face, and how shall we discharge it? To the English general, exulting in his new laurels and flushed with his fresh triumph, there will remain the duty, not less severe and anxious, of counselling the Government at home upon the future of the Soudan. Whatever Lord Wolseley advises will be done, and his decision must depend upon conditions which he cannot yet precisely have ascertained. It is for him to suggest some mode of administering the country. England cannot administer it, and when the object of the expedition has been achieved and Gordon is safe, English honour must be satisfied and the English troops withdrawn. The idea that unless the British flag waves in perpetuity over Khartoum, Egypt will be exposed to the risk of invasion by the Soudanese may be dismissed. The rude and intrepid tribesmen of the desert have no power of rapid mobilisation, and are as little formidable outside the limits of their native tracts as they are formidable within them.

While our troops have been forcing their way to Khartoum our statesmen have been deliberating upon the financial affairs of Egypt. Both events have coincided with the arrival in this country of an envoy from the Sultan. Fehmi Pacha travelled to London *via* Berlin and Paris. At the former capital he failed to see Prince Bismarck or Count Hatzfeldt, and was courteously informed by a subordinate official that if he desired to discuss the Egyptian question with European statesmen he would do well to direct his footsteps further west. At the French capital he had an interview with M. Ferry, as he has had in London with Lord Granville. A daily newspaper, with a recklessness that ill becomes its traditions and influence, has asserted that the English Government have assured Fehmi Pacha of their willingness to hand over the Soudan to the Sultan. We may venture to say that the emissary of the Kaliphate has received from Mr. Glad-

stone's Cabinet no definite assurance of any kind, and that he will return to Constantinople without having accomplished much by his occidental trip. He has come hither, no doubt, full of many projects to be pressed upon the English Government, and the depositary of many grandiose schemes cherished by his impracticable master. The assertion of the Sultan's suzerainty in Egypt and in the Soudan, the replacement of Tewfik by a Khedive more agreeable to Stamboul, the aggrandisement of the Khalif with the help of England in the Mahometan world, the replenishment of the Imperial coffers with money procured from any quarter, are unquestionably among the objects dear to Abdul Hamid, and among the commissions with which he has intrusted his representative. But the Sultan will gain absolutely nothing by his present experiment. He is a dreamer of dreams; the vague believer in the realisation of far-reaching fantastic and impossible visions. By no means wanting in intellectual qualities, he is totally destitute of practical sagacity. He does not reckon with facts which have either been accomplished already or which are in process of accomplishment. His statecraft and policy are as visionary as the medium through which he looks at mere rational and political forces is unreal. If one can imagine an Oriental edition of Napoleon III., with all his idiosyncratic failings reflected upon a scale as grotesque as that on which mirrors of a certain fashion distort the features of the countenance, and no bad notion will be formed of the present Sultan. It is not of such stuff that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century Orientals who win a place in the system of European politics are made.

The administration of Egypt will therefore, one may be sure, be settled independently of the ruler of the Faithful, and it will be settled, as we have repeatedly said must be the case, by an agreement between England and France. The Governments of the two countries are now negotiating on the basis of the French counter proposals, as they are called, or, as they would be more correctly styled, the Anglo-French proposals. France has accepted the principle of the reduction of the coupon. She abstains from pressing for a limit of the occupation of Egypt by English troops, and she is willing to acquiesce in the arrangement which two years ago Lord Granville himself suggested for the Suez Canal. There remain the manner in which the Egyptian loan is to be guaranteed, and the alleged necessity of a future and international inquiry into Egyptian finance. The Government is taunted by the *Times* with having capitulated to France, because Ministers have not peremptorily told M. Ferry that they intended to deal with Egypt without any consideration for the ideas of their neighbours. But at present they have done nothing more than say that they are willing to discuss the proposal of a joint Guarantee, provided that it does not involve a revival of the joint

control or the creation of a multiple control. Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues may be setting about the work in the right way or the wrong, but the value of the work done can only be shown by results, and of these we can know nothing save by conjecture. It is premature to apply language suitable only to accomplished facts to the negotiations now pending between the French and English cabinets. Meanwhile there is this to be said. A settlement of our Egyptian difficulties which may involve no wound to French sensitiveness, will remove from our path innumerable anxieties and dangers. If we are never to establish between France and ourselves relations of warm friendship, we need not multiply avoidable causes of friction.

There are other considerations which ought to make us slow to condemn the Government for paying reasonable regard to the susceptibilities of the French people. Deeply as it is to be regretted, nothing is to be gained by ignoring the fact, that Prince Bismarck's humour towards the English Government is not more amiable than it was six months ago. As he has himself said in the Reichstag it is absurd to speak of the possibility of an open rupture between England and Germany. None the less the Chancellor shows no disposition to smooth our path in Egypt or elsewhere, and so far from endeavouring to facilitate an understanding between France and England with respect to Egypt, he has done not a little to accentuate and inflame our international differences with our nearest continental neighbour. The prospect, therefore, which there is reason to believe is now gradually becoming assured, of an arrangement with France will be equivalent to a diplomatic rebuff inflicted upon Prince Bismarck. There are other reasons than resentment against the neglect, which he complains of having received at the hands of English ministers, that may account for Prince Bismarck's present attitude towards England and France. The life of the German Emperor is not likely, under any circumstances, to be prolonged, and with his death Prince Bismarck will be confronted by a formidable array of influences hostile to his policy. The Crown Princess is notoriously adverse to the Chancellor. The Crown Prince is far from a cordial supporter of the exclusive reliance which Prince Bismarck places upon Austria and Russia, and would willingly see a *rapprochement* with France and England. In proportion as France is occupied with military enterprises abroad and England is alienated from Germany, it is difficult or impossible for the Fatherland to make friendly advances towards the two Western powers, and in proportion as France and England are mutually estranged, Prince Bismarck has the satisfaction of knowing that the powers of the two countries for the future co-operation are diminished. Unquestionably the chief aims of our foreign policy ought to be cordial alliance with Germany and a good understanding with France; but if



Prince Bismarck, for reasons of his own, is bent upon making the former of these objects impossible, we should lose no opportunity of endeavouring to achieve the latter.

By those with whom the wish is father to the thought, 'nothing less than the collapse of the Government and the disruption of the Liberal party have of late been repeatedly predicted upon two grounds. The foreign policy of Ministers, it has been said, has excited a coalition of the European powers against England; and in proportion as the people become alive to the isolation of England, they will rise up against the administration of Mr. Gladstone. The second plea on which the doom of Liberalism is pronounced is that the line of cleavage between the sections composing it is ominously broadening, and must at no distant date develop into a schism. As regards the former of these prognostications, it is sufficiently disposed of by the cool and statesmanlike comments on the situation, which have appeared in the *Standard*. That journal, with a clearness of vision and a superiority to the prejudices and parrot cries of partisanship, that are worthy of the highest praise, has consistently argued, and proved, that the notion of a combination of France and Germany, hostile to England, is the last contingency in the world likely to be realised. How little Prince Bismarck cares to conciliate French feeling when any serious German interest with which it clashes is involved, may be judged from General Manteuffel's address to the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine, plainly admonishing them that, while the German Government are anxious to accord them the same treatment as is enjoyed by other States of the Empire, it must be upon the condition that they accept incorporation in the German Imperial system as permanent. The relations between France and Germany will not have been improved by the progress of the Congo Conference. The latest news is that France, ignoring the decisions of the plenipotentiaries, has entered into an arrangement with Portugal, by which the latter recognises French sovereignty on the north side of the river to the mouth, France ratifying the Portuguese claim to the southern littoral. Prince Bismarck will scarcely acquiesce in this settlement, and it is to be wished that at such a crisis Sir Edward Malet had received more definite instructions than appears to be the case. So far as concerns the omens disastrous to Ministers, discovered by party critics in the temper of the country at the events of the past month, or in the misgivings and alarms which, as is alleged, the speeches of certain leaders of the Liberal party have excited, it is enough to say that no agitation against the Government has been set on foot in any part of the kingdom, and nothing more menacing to Liberal unity has taken place than the withdrawal by Mr. Goschen of his name from the Devonshire and Reform Clubs.

That we are rapidly approaching a new and critical stage in the

alism may indeed be readily admitted. At the present the Cabinet, or chief feature in domestic politics is the paralysis of Conlines which Lord Salisbury is in the south of France, Lord Randolph drawal of Sir in India, and the most enthusiastic admirers of Sir Stafford we venture will not venture to say that he has refused the country by they wewonshire speeches, or credit them with any of the inspiring in- Thereence of contagious passion. However vehemently the most vituperadone organs of the Opposition may denounce the Government, the fact to remains that the responsible leaders of the Conservative party have no thowish to assume the weight of the Ministerial burdens and desire nothing bmore than to co-operate with Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues for v passing the Redistribution Act at the earliest moment. They have, in plain fact, so far as the belligerent functions of an Opposition are concerned, abdicated. The utmost, apparently, which they hope, is that they may win the favour of the new constituencies; or, as Lord Salisbury and other Tories, if they were to use the language of perfect candour, might say, that the new constituencies might enable them to reduce their minority. If, then, the Liberals have little to fear from without, is there much which they need seriously dread from within? If the formal opposition of the Conservatives is not going to oust them from power just yet, are they about to fall the victims of their own internal dissensions? No one will deny that doctrines have recently been propounded by the chiefs of the more advanced section of the Liberal party unpalatable to moderate Liberals or Whigs. The speeches of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, and the programme of reforms which they contain, indicating as they undoubtedly do that the Radical legislation of the future will proceed upon what may be roughly called Socialistic lines, have caused in some quarters quite a serious flutter. That the first business of the new Parliament will be to deal with the reform of Local Government in counties, and that this will be the precursor of drastic measures of Land Reform, is as certain as anything can be which awaits its fulfilment. The socialistic question, daily growing more acute i Germany, must be fairly confronted in England. It is only natur for some members of the great, but loosely coherent and heterogeneous Liberal party, to shrink from the bold expedients which the leas. of the people have determined that it will be necessary to propow

The retrospect of the extra parliamentary rhetoric of the new year may remind the prophets of Liberal disruption of one important fact. The addresses of Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain have revealed, to a degree for which many persons were unprepared preconcerted harmony of conviction—a designed coincidence of political purpose. Whoever may be their lieutenants in the future, are, therefore, justified in saying that the Radical leadership that will continue to be, a duumvirate. The solidarity between they as will be

sidents of the Local Government Board and of the non making the instead of diminishing, grows, and the Liberals who insist opportunity of entiating themselves from Radicals must lay their account circumstance. Be it so, we shall be told. Granted nothing less men are prepared to go the same lengths; that does not of the mean the triumph of Radicalism, nor dispose of the proba two that when Mr. Gladstone has once quitted his position the ties w. has now hold Liberals and Radicals together will be burst asunder. Wd in this event, for which the whole Conservative creation yearns, may take place it would be rash to predict. But it was only to be expected that Mr. Gladstone's health and years should cause many to forecast the possibility. As his eldest son said in his speech to his tenants at Hawarden three weeks ago, the time cannot under any circumstances be distant when the Prime Minister will bring a career that has extended over half a century to a close. Whether the passage of the Redistribution Bill or the settlement of the Egyptian business will furnish the signal for this one need not speculate. It is the fact, rather than its accidental circumstances, which concerns us. There are three distinct contingencies possible on the assumption of Mr. Gladstone's retirement during the Session now about to commence. Let us look at them in the order of their improbability. First it may be said that Mr. Gladstone's withdrawal would involve the resignation of his Government. Discredited by their foreign and colonial policy, smarting perhaps beneath the sense of fresh blunders which there is still time enough to perpetrate, and new disasters which they may be destined to incur, ministers would tremble at the thought of attempting to carry on the affairs of the country when the chief, who has alone imparted an appearance of cohesion to his Cabinet and by his personal ascendancy among his countrymen secured immunity for its manifold mistakes, had gone. In this case, Conservatives would, against their will, be called upon to form an administration. Their refusal to do so in the present parliament might precipitate a dissolution, or they might assume the responsibility upon the understanding that there should be a dissolution at the first opportunity practicable. We should then have a purely provisional Ministry, a mere *pis aller*, an arrangement which would amount to a suspension of the duties of Government and of Parliament itself to the new constituencies.

Let us now pass on to a second alternative. Mr. Gladstone's retirement would leave the path open for Lord Hartington, the more especially since it is not a very violent hypothesis that Mr. Gladstone be accompanied by Lord Granville. Lord Hartington, it is just conceivable, convinced that the country was disgusted with Radicalism, and that the chance for the moderate Liberals and the Whigs Mr. G. and that the chance for the moderate Liberals and the Whigs Thane, might conceive and execute the design of remodelling.

the Cabinet, or rather of fashioning an altogether new Cabinet, upon lines which would entirely exclude the Radicals, compel the withdrawal of Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Trevelyan, and, we venture to think, one or two more ministers whose names, if they were now mentioned, might be received with incredulity. There is no reason to suppose that if Lord Hartington were to adopt such tactics as these, the Radicals would offer any objection to the arrangement. They would support, so far as they could, the Whig administration during the brief interval that must elapse before the general election took place, early next year. They would occupy the recess in agitating the country, and when the dissolution came they would appeal to the constituencies on a distinct issue, that of Radicalism against Whiggism. If they were defeated, it is not with the Whigs that the victory would rest. All experience shows that the electorate is divided into mutually opposing camps and that between these there is no room for any third and hybrid party which may claim to partake of some of the attributes of both, and which may call itself Whig, Moderate Liberal, Anti-Radical, National, or by any other name. The only Liberalism which is tolerated in the constituencies is the Liberalism of the advanced section of the Liberal party. This is unreservedly true of the boroughs, and it may be found equally true of the counties. A political connection which shall attract the sweet reasonableness of all parties, which may have as its leaders men like Mr. Goschen and Mr. Forster, is the natural dream of timid and amiable visionaries. But though Mr. Goschen may appear to coquet, now with invertebrate Conservatives, who might just as well call themselves Whigs, and now with the noble, right honourable and honourable personages who have spent some portion of the Christmas vacation in cuballing against the Radicals, he knows perfectly well that a third or a moderate party, the result of a coalition or a conspiracy, is an impossibility. A year hence the Radicals or the Conservatives may have been voted by the country to power. We will not predict which it will be, but we do not fear to predict that it will not, under any circumstances, be those who rejoice in the title of the Moderates. The democracy may show itself Radical or Tory. It will not show itself Whig to gratify Mr. Forster and Mr. Goschen, or their patrician patrons.

There is a third prospect and one that is, perhaps, more likely than either of its predecessors to be realized. Suppose, as we supposed just now, that Mr. Gladstone hands over the reins of power to Lord Hartington, that, as is practically certain to be the case, there are two or three places in the Cabinet to be filled, and that Lord Hartington does not determine to fill them up in such a way as to necessitate the retirement of the Radical ministers. What will be

the consequence? We shall then have, as we have now, and have had since the ministry of 1880 was formed, a mixed Government. This is all which Radicals could want, and will assuredly be all on which they will insist. Of course, they will claim, and receive something in consideration of their forbearance. The effect of the arrangement thus arrived at will be, that, while the Whigs hold a larger proportion of the high offices of State, the Radicals will exercise a preponderating influence in the policy of the country. Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Trevelyan, may only have one or two brother ministers who are in full sympathy with them. But they will have what will be infinitely more important—the controlling power, the real initiative in the business of responsible statesmanship. The more closely this solution is examined the more plausible it will be found. When in these days people speak of a Whig policy and of a government based upon plain Whig principles, it is necessary to remind them that the only principles which Whiggism possesses are negative, and that a policy based upon the principles of negation is an impossibility. Whenever Whiggism has operated as a progressive and energising power it has been because it caught the contagion of, and was inspired by, the ideas and propulsive forces of Radicalism. Moreover, any other arrangement, than that just put forward, proceeds upon the assumption that Lord Hartington is secretly desirous of breaking up the Cabinet. If this is his wish why should he not have gratified it long before now? He has had many opportunities, some would say he has received many provocations, to separate himself from a Cabinet congenitally tainted with the vices of Radicalism. Why should he not, therefore, if his disposition is what it is vaguely represented as being, have availed himself of some one of these? why, in other words, should he wait till Mr. Gladstone's retirement to do what he might have done more courageously and more effectually, six months, a twelve-month, two years ago?

The truth is that Lord Hartington's alleged anxiety to dissociate himself from the new Liberal *régime* is the figment of polite alarmism which attributes to him as the scion of an illustrious house and the heir to the Dukedom of Devonshire, with a shrinking from Radicalism because it is not respectable, and an aversion to the democracy or a democratic Parliament because it is likely to be lacking in the refinements and graces of good society. To these highly respectable and genteel persons we cordially commend the manly and sensible speeches made last week by Mr. Trevelyan and Sir Henry James. Commenting upon the complete collapse of the crusade for proportional representation—a collapse so complete that in several cases the audiences which have listened with patience and attention to Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Courtney's speeches have passed votes condemning their

proposals ; a collapse produced by the just and clear-sighted conviction that the scheme is impracticable, and that if it were practicable it would only result in the return to Parliament of hobbyists and crotcheteers—and on the deterioration of Parliament, which it is apprehended may be produced by single-member constituencies, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster enumerated a few plain facts which cannot be repeated too often. “I cannot,” said Mr. Trevelyan, “share this panic about vestrymen. If we get into the House of Commons men who have been trained in the management of local affairs, and who have won the confidence of their neighbours by the probity and ability with which they have managed those affairs, I think the result will be not to degrade the House of Commons, but to elevate and dignify and render more attractive the career and the position of a local administrator ; and a greater and more permanent advantage to the country it would be difficult to name. But I am satisfied that we shall get in the House of Commons none but the best and choicest of those who have made their name in local administration. The British elector will never put up with a really inferior and unworthy local man as long as he can get a really superior man who begins his connexion with the constituency as a stranger. For a stranger he will not long remain, and I will venture to say that I could name a dozen members in the House of Commons who are as popular with their constituents, although they reside at a distance from them, as any dozen who reside on the spot.” Not less noticeable was Sir Henry James’s convincing demonstration that the extension of the Franchise has in past times proved conducive to the cause of popular improvement. In the five years ending with 1864, the annual average of persons sentenced to penal servitude in England and Wales was 2,800. In the five years ending 1884, it had, notwithstanding the immense increase in the population, sunk to 1,400, or just one-half. This diminution was noticeable rather amongst the young than amongst the old. It is, therefore, no purely fanciful inference that the improvement may be directly connected with the spread of education among the rising generation. It is far cheaper, in Sir Henry James’s words, to pay even a moderate school master than the best of prison warders. As we owe the Education Act of 1870 to the Reform Bill of 1867, so it will hereafter be said we owe the system of universal, free and compulsory education, which will then be established, to the Reform Bill begun in 1884, and completed in 1885. It is not, as Lord Hartington is well aware, the era of popular degradation upon which we are now entering ; but the era of popular improvement—of a higher conception and a more conscientious discharge of the duties of citizenship.

Next to Egypt and the Soudan, the most prominent question during the past month has been the colonial relations of Germany

and England. The Angra Pequena White Book has been followed by another on the Fiji Islands, containing revelations equally unpleasant. It is, however, better to attempt to form a general idea of the colonial movement now going forward in Germany than to recapitulate the contents of what are now familiar documents. At first sight it would seem that Prince Bismarck's idea of a colonial empire were better fitted for the wealthy firms of Bremen and Hamburg than for the mass of the German people. If this be the case, the new Teutonic dominion will conform to the type of the old Dutch commercial kingdom rather than to that of the modern British colony. Again, in considering whether the schemes of the Chancellor are likely to commend themselves to the bulk of his countrymen, it must not be forgotten that the migrations from Germany hitherto proceeded exclusively on what may be called the domestic principle. Thus, both the extensive settlements of Germans in Russia at the end of the last, and in the United States in the earlier part of the present, century, were almost entirely composed of the agricultural class, and were usually constituted, not by an aggregation of individuals from different districts, but by a simultaneous removal of a whole village, who by migrating together insured considerable alleviation to the necessary isolation of their new homes. Even now, in the rural districts of Germany, it is generally one or several families, and not an individual, who emigrate; and under present circumstances their course is naturally determined by the knowledge that in the bosom of the great American Republic they will find the welcome of their kindred, and immediately share with them all the rights of American citizenship. It is not, therefore, surprising that the vast majority of German emigrants of the agricultural classes should prefer a country about which they know everything to others about which they know little or nothing. While German traders have established their agencies in every part of the inhabited globe, they have not hitherto been successful in attracting, in any marked degree, the agricultural population of Germany to the scenes of their operations. The great bulk of that yearly export of human labour, which is depopulating certain rural districts of Germany, still continues to swell in an ever-increasing volume the riches and the census returns of the United States of America.

The colonial policy of Prince Bismarck, however, is not confined to those portions of the world's surface most frequented by subjects of the Fatherland. The Australian colonies, with the exception of New South Wales, are at this moment protesting energetically against the German acquisitions in New Guinea and the adjacent islands. To those who can view the situation calmly, the attitude of the Australians must appear somewhat unreasonable. The fact of having Germany as a neighbour is at least not a calamity. In a few years'

time Australia\* will be sufficiently strong to become mistress of every inch of land in the South Seas. Meanwhile the so-called frontier which she will have to guard should supply a very healthy nationalising influence, and afford the strongest argument in favour of an Australasian dominion which it is possible to advance. Canada, as Sir Lyon Playfair said at the meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute on January 18, federated in a time of profound peace. Why should not Australia federate in a time of peace too? That German colonists will make any extensive use of New Guinea whilst Australia and Canada are open to them is not very likely, and, even though they were to do so, from a defensive and strategic point of view our Antipodean fellow-subjects have the best of it. The protectorate proclaimed over the Louisiade Group and Huon Bay by the Commodore of the Australian squadron, assures them possession of the key to the whole position. The chief complaint of the Australians is that momentous questions affecting themselves are decided in Europe without reference to the Antipodes. Probably the only remedy for this is some form of Imperial federation, and Lord Grey's proposal to attach to the Privy Council a Colonial Board of advice is, on the face of it, the most practical that has yet been made for giving the colonies a voice in Imperial affairs. As Lord Norton suggests in his reply to Mr. Forster's strictures on our duties to our dependencies, colonists cannot expect all the rights and none of the responsibilities. The real pinching of the shoe will come when they are admitted to a share in the administration of Imperial affairs and are also called upon to contribute to Imperial taxation.

In South Africa military preparations are being pushed forward, and the whole aspect of the country is that of one on the eve of war. The original motive of the expedition must be borne in mind. Ostensibly Great Britain wishes to restore a Bechuana chief to his hereditary domain after repelling the Boer intruders. This is a small matter, and it may be assumed that it is well within Sir Charles Warren's power. Possibly the Boers may retire over the Transvaal border and leave him in undisputed possession of the country. Having marched to Bechuanaland our troops may march back again. Some visible result may have been gained, but no permanent peace. The territory itself may be handed over to the Cape Colony. A sympathetic Cape ministry may, after receiving it, allow the Transvaalers to step in again. The Imperial Government will have to stand by and witness what they cannot prevent. There is another policy which the Imperial Government, with the troops they have at their disposal in South Africa, can carry out. They can annex Zululand, Bechuanaland and Pondoland, and, including Basutoland, form a series of Crown colonies under a strict and firm British Protectorate. An able and strong High



Commissioner placed with large discretionary powers over such territories would relieve, incidentally, the present High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson, of many of those burdensome and incongruous duties which now fall to his lot, in his double capacity of a constitutional Governor of the Cape Colony and High Commissioner of the native territories outside. The native territories thus grouped under a definite ruler and governed directly from England might pay the expenses of their government by means of an equable hut tax. The Cape Colony would have its own native question in the Transkei, and might still continue to be exercised in the art of governing native dependencies. In proper time and under proper conditions the people of South Africa may be intrusted with the unlimited control of their native questions. At present there is such a friction between classes and such a chaos of contending nationalities that it is wiser for England, as the paramount power in South Africa, to take up a clear and definite position. It has been the uncertainty of England's intention in South Africa which has quenched loyalty and baffled calculations. There is enough loyalty to England in South Africa to carry her flag forward if Imperial ministers will act resolutely. The enthusiastic receptions which have greeted Sir Charles Warren at Kimberley and elsewhere are not mere vain Jingoistic displays. They are the loud and emphatic expressions of British colonists for the assertion of an Imperial position. There are rumours that our officers are preparing to seize Largenck and Majuba Hill, positions within Natal territory and commanding the road to Pretoria. Indications are not wanting in South Africa of race animosity. At a large "Bond" meeting at Potchefstroom resolutions were passed in favour of a union between the Free State and the Transvaal, previous objections to such a political development having been removed, so the Boers urge, by the Convention of 1884. It need hardly be pointed out that a combination of the Afrikaner element with avowedly hostile purposes might imperil the interests of our South African Empire. Another scheme has been propounded by which it is hoped that peace may be restored. It is suggested that, after the Bechuana difficulty has been removed, a conference should be held of representatives from all the South African settlements, Dutch as well as English, in order to adjust boundaries and ratify existing obligations. Such a conference has certainly in South Africa ample scope for its deliberations, and is the dream of politicians, but what can be the advantage of including, for instance, the Transvaal deputies under such a scheme when they have so recently and flagrantly ignored the sanctity of treaties? Zululand, Pondoland, and possibly the Transkei, would still have to be separately treated by the Imperial Government. Africa has had enough of treaties, conferences, and commissions. What she now wants is government at the hands of a strong power.

Passing from the political to the commercial and industrial

chronicle of the month, we may find in the recently published trade reports good ground for the belief that, although the decline in prices and the necessity for serious changes in the course and conduct of trade may continue for awhile to involve both inconvenience and loss to many well-established interests, the present depression is not very deep-seated, or likely to be permanent. A certain amount of the suffering imposed upon the commerce of the whole world is due to the arbitrary interference of foreign governments with the ordinary and natural courses of trade. The very cheapness of our imports is an indication that foreigners are compelled by some circumstance, whether it be heavy taxation or want of holding power, to turn their produce rapidly into cash in the English market, or such other markets as are governed by rates current here. The chief consideration for the British traders seems to be, after all, to find a remedy for over-supply, and adopt measures that will secure an increase of consumption. If it be one of the grievances of importers that the low rates at outports do not secure buyers to the extent that might be expected, may not this be largely due to our imperfect systems of distribution? Legislation seems to have succeeded in bringing cheap food supplies to our shores, but the full benefit fails as yet to reach the individual housekeeper. How would it else be possible for best English wheat to fetch for months together 29s. per quarter, and the price of bread for most middle-class households to remain the same as when the market rate for wheat was 45s. per quarter? And of what use to the ordinary housekeeper is the knowledge that sales of sugar are made at 1d. and 1½d. per lb., or tea at 9d. and 1s. per lb., when he can only obtain inferior teas as a rule at 2s. per lb., and sugar at 3½d. to 4d. per lb.? It is true the Co-operative Stores help somewhat to reduce his domestic expenses, but the reductions in daily necessities in eggs, butter, groceries, bacon, fish and meat reach his door very tardily. There seems a large field yet at home for the expansion of the volume of national trade, and thousands of families whom the benefits of cheap food supplies have not yet or but very irregularly and imperfectly reached.

It is said in a hopeless kind of way that the revival of the export trade is only possible when the purchasing power of foreign countries increases, but evidently much may be done to increase foreign demand from additional cheapness, and to obtain prices for what we *do* export more remunerative to producers and distributing agents. Thus, what more startling than to find the average charge for royalty on one ton of pig iron to amount in this country to six *shillings*, as against a like aggregate average of *sixpence* per ton in Germany, eight pence per ton in France, and fifteen pence to four shillings per ton in Belgium. The production of pig iron of all kinds in the United Kingdom being over eight million tons, and our exports of the article over one and a quarter million tons, it ceases to be a matter of such

surprise that foreign industries, fostered on all sides by the artificial stimulus of protection, should have developed into very serious competition for the world's trade as well as their own home demand. The heavy royalties payable to the landlords of the soil on the minerals raised therefrom act as a premium on foreign industry and an additional handicap on the British iron trade, and having reached an average of six shillings per ton, are so greatly out of proportion to the present current market rates for the produce, that it would seem impossible for many concerns to continue the business of smelting the ores that lie under the soil.

The fact seems to be that every improvement and advance of late years has been so quickly followed by an increase of royalty that the profits of manufacturing concerns may be said to have often gone straight into the pocket of the mineral landlord, and pretty much to the exclusion of any benefit to those who have developed and imparted value to his estate. The necessity for a change in the relations of our complex industrial system, if properly represented by struggling manufacturers to those whom it concerned, would, no doubt, in many instances, result in the return of a portion of the royalty agreed upon, in the same way that agricultural landlords are wont to consider the hardness of the times by liberal reductions of rent. Under the circumstances mentioned, it must also cease to surprise that we should have become so largely dependent on foreign supplies of ore. Over two and a quarter million tons were imported in 1884 from Spain alone, and makers in many cases find it in every way more profitable to import than to raise the ore under their very feet or draw their supplies from neighbouring districts.

The question of cost of transport is becoming almost a vital one to many industries, especially as the inland situation of so many long-established works imposes at least a double railway rate on the export branch of their trade, viz., that on raw material imported, which has to be forwarded from an outport to the works, and then the back journey by rail of the manufactured article for shipment from the outport. As competition increases it is this railway rate and its multiplication that determine the profit, and with this the acceptance or refusal of business. Once at the port, many sea routes to destination, direct or more or less circuitous, are open for the transport of export articles; and these routes can be studied, and that adopted which varying freights show to be the most economical of the day. But railways with hard and fixed rates to the general trader, and by no means moderate terminal and other charges, are not an optional means of transport, but a monopoly, and though for a time arbitrary or preferential action on the part of railway companies may be endured, it cannot be supposed that they will be allowed to remain an impediment or an incubus.

*January 28, 1885.*

THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CCXIX. NEW SERIES.—MARCH 1, 1885.

THE COMING LAND BILL.

DURING the last three months discussion on the land question has so far advanced that it is now possible to forecast, with some confidence, the proposals on which there will be a general agreement among reformers, and those which will form the subject of debate between the more and the less progressive sections of the new House of Commons. Leaving out of sight for the present the questions relating to householders in towns and their ground-landlords, there are three principles which may be said to have definitely established themselves in public opinion, and to furnish the problems which the Legislature will be called upon to solve. These principles are the following:—(1) That restrictions which interfere with the free and natural dealing in land must be abolished; (2) that if the existing relation of landlord and tenant can be shown in any degree to have contributed to the present agricultural collapse, or to hinder the country from rallying from it, that relation must be amended in the public interest; and (3) that it is for the interest of the nation that the use and enjoyment of land should be more widely diffused than it is at present. I put aside, as beyond practical politics, Mr. George's scheme for nationalization, and treat as equally visionary the opinion of those who imagine that after our electorate is re-organized the nation will tolerate our existing landed arrangements unchanged.

Where then, in the middle ground of the practicable, do we find the inside and the outside measurements of the changes which a new Parliament may be expected to undertake? The outside measurement perhaps in certain speeches of Mr. Chamberlain, and in a draft Bill for the creation of a peasant-proprietary, circulated by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jesse Collings; the inside measurement in the speeches of Mr. Goschen, especially in his very careful discourse delivered at Edinburgh on February 1st. What Mr. Goschen accepts will probably be, and has in fact been, accepted as authoritative by the semi-Conservative organs of middle-class opinion. It is therefore important to notice at starting that Mr. Goschen explicitly abandons the position of the older political economists, who, like Sir James Caird, make it the object of a land-system only to produce the

greatest amount of food with the least expenditure of labour. "From a social point of view," says Mr. Goschen, "I do not think it easy to exaggerate the advantage of having a large number of small proprietors; and I am not convinced by any argument that tells me that if you proceed on these lines, the aggregate produce of the country will be less. I can conceive it would be better that less produce should be raised in the country at large, while having a larger number of landed proprietors, than to see the whole land of the country remaining in the hands of a few, with a larger aggregate produce from the soil." This admission of Mr. Goschen's puts out of court—certainly not as a piece of scientific reasoning, but as a guide to coming legislation—the letter of Sir James Caird in defence of our existing system, which was published in the *Times* on the same day as Mr. Goschen's Edinburgh address, and which the Conservative chorus, with an amusing want of perspicacity, extolled in the same breath with Mr. Goschen's speech, not perceiving that the two lines of argument were in contradiction to one another and mutually destructive. If Mr. Goschen is right, Sir James Caird's deductions are quite beside the point, for he recognises no standard but that of the maximum of production. If Sir James is right, Mr. Goschen is preaching rank heresy. Both indeed are bombarding Mr. Chamberlain; but their shells fly into one another's camp.

There appears to me little doubt that public opinion, rightly or wrongly, has left behind it the old standpoint of the economists who asked only how to produce as much as possible. Therefore, although in my own personal judgment I should attach much more weight to anything said by Sir James Caird on the land-question than to anything said by Mr. Goschen, and am aware of nothing which makes Mr. Goschen a real authority on this subject, yet as he unquestionably represents a strong political section both among Liberals and intelligent Conservatives, I take his expressions on land-reform as valuable data in helping us to estimate the minimum likely to content those who desire any reform at all. Mr. Goschen's words are, with some condensation, as follows:—"I wish to see any fetters still remaining on the owners of land struck off, which prevent their dealing in the freest possible way with their land. I wish to see it made as saleable as Consols. I am not sure that we shall have reached the goal of our endeavours unless we have every title to land registered. I should like to see a land-register in every great local centre, in which transfers of land might take place with not very much greater difficulty than transfers of Consols take place in the Bank of England. There are many owners prepared to sell; why do not people buy? I believe that it is in consequence of the great difficulties as regards transfer,—settlement, entail, and all the legal difficulties of the case. It is bad for the country that the existing owner should be controlled by the dead hand of his ancestors. I say, let the living hand grasp

the living soil." And in warning his audience against "crude panaceas" like the Three F's, Mr. Goschen adds, "Let us try freedom first before we try interference of the State. I want to plead the cause of freedom against State interference; and that is one of the old Radical doctrines."

Now if the above phrases about the dead and the living hand are not a mere flourish of rhetoric, and a very misleading and unjustifiable one, they must mean that the "owner" of land is to be the owner out and out; that is, that family-settlements, which make the head of the family for the time being a mere life-owner, with "remainders" vested in other people, must be absolutely abolished. Simple forms of transfer are excellent things, but Mr. Goschen must know perfectly well that what makes a man sell anything is, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the desire to obtain the purchase-money. Lord Cairns, and the superior persons who drew up the Settled Land Act of 1882, affected to ignore this very rudimentary fact of human nature, and pretended to have done all that was necessary when they gave the tenant-for-life power to sell, but left the purchase-money subject to the trusts of the settlement. They moreover expressly excluded from the operation of their Act the family mansion on each estate and the grounds usually held with it, so that an encumbered owner who wished to get rid once and for all of the millstone round his neck, and to start in a less pretentious position, could not do so. It is impossible that Mr. Goschen, with his dislike for the "dead hand," and his clear perception of the motives from which men really sell and buy, can intend anything less than the establishment of absolute ownership in land, and the extinction of all legal devices which give to the "owner" for the time being a merely fractional interest in the land or in the money for which it may be sold. I conclude therefore that no improved patchwork on the pattern of 1882 will satisfy Mr. Goschen and those whom he represents, but that they will demand from Government the abolition of family-settlements root and branch. Here then is the first point of the coming land-reform.

It will, however, be no easy matter to give effect to this decision. A competent draftsman could no doubt draw up a Bill providing that, where any life-estate is followed by remainders over, the person first beneficially entitled should take both a legal and beneficial estate in fee-simple; but the real difficulty will arise over mortgages and charges, and on this Mr. Goschen gives us absolutely no glimmer of light. On the one hand, if you wholly forbid mortgages you interfere with that natural and convenient use of land in which, like any article of personal property, it does duty as a pledge for repayment of money lent; and, on the other hand, if you allow mortgages and charges, you enable an owner of land who desires to tie it up in reality if not in name, to charge the land with a yearly payment amounting to its full value in favour of a succession of persons, and

so in effect to restore family-settlements. It will tax the ingenuity of the best lawyers whom the Government can consult to solve these difficulties satisfactorily. It appears to me absolutely useless to think of abolishing mortgages altogether, though of course if land is literally to be made as saleable as Consols, this would have to be done, for Consols, as an article of sale, belong absolutely to the person or persons in whose name they stand, and no one else can possess any recognised property in them. With a good deal of diffidence, and more with the hope of getting better suggestions from others than of solving the difficulty myself, I would suggest that a radical distinction be made between mortgages which are really commercial transactions, and charges on land made without pecuniary consideration, such as annuities to younger children; that the latter be made absolutely null and void, but that in the case of mortgages no more be required than that they be registered like Bills of Sale in a public office, with an affidavit setting forth the consideration. Owners of estates would then be unable to encumber them by the too-easy method of creating a charge in favour of their descendants, instead of selling the land and leaving them the money. And I cannot believe that when all mortgages were laid bare to the public eye, like Bills of Sale, landed proprietors would be so obstinately wedded to the existing system as to borrow large sums in order to create annuities by settling the interest of them upon their younger children. It is one thing to instruct a solicitor to insert in a will the words, "I charge my estate with the payment of £300 per annum to my son Henry," and another thing to go with a money-covenant before a public official, to take an oath that you have really received the money alleged, and to see the transaction possibly recorded next Monday in a trade-advertiser among the compromising obligations of struggling shopkeepers.

If in the matter of family-settlements Mr. Goschen only tells us what we ought to do, without giving us the least hint how to do it, there is certainly no want of definiteness in his recommendations with regard to transfer. There is to be a register of title at each local centre. A register of title is beyond doubt something concrete, something that can be felt and handled; and Mr. Goschen makes us clearly understand that *every* title is to be registered. The object of registration being increased facility of sale, it follows that a transfer effected through the registry must give an indefeasible title; otherwise the register would only be one additional title-deed for lawyers to examine: that is, the register must not be a mere entry-book of deeds, like those now existing in Middlesex and Yorkshire, but must be a scientific, authoritative, and conclusive record of the legal effect of every transaction in any way affecting any land within the district. An intending purchaser of a piece of land must be entitled to walk into the registry-office and ask the officials, "Who is the owner of such and such a field?" and the official must have the means of saying to

him, "The owner is A B, and if you purchase from A B, and register your purchase in this office, Her Majesty's Government guarantees your absolute right against all persons and against all claims whatsoever." That is the meaning of a Government registry. It exists already in the United States; and it was proposed in Mr. Trevelyan's Irish Purchase Bill, in May last, to establish such machinery in Ireland for purchases to be effected under certain conditions by tenants. Nothing more perfect in the way of land-transfer can be imagined than the system which Mr. Gladstone's Government then proposed to establish in Ireland; and although the measure excited little attention in the political hubbub of last session, and had to be dropped as soon as introduced, it will undoubtedly serve as a model to those who desire the establishment of a universal registration of title in England. Observe, however, that while Government only proposed to establish this registration in the case of certain specific purchases to be effected by Irish tenants, Mr. Goschen distinctly demands that the registration of title in England shall be compulsory and universal. What English landlords will say to this it will be interesting to observe. Mr. Goschen is a man of very nice discrimination in matters of liberty, and he tells us that he is "pleading the cause of freedom against State interference;" otherwise one might have thought that a measure compelling every one who claimed any species of interest in land—any right, present or future, any mortgage or charge, easement, common-right, dowry, pension or annuity in any way connected with land, to place his papers in the hands of a Government official, to disclose and lay bare before the public every fault in his title and every gap in his proof of lawful ownership, and when this is done to pay for the very considerable cost of the operation—this, I say, but for Mr. Goschen's assurance that he is pleading for individual freedom against State interference, would appear to me about as resolute and far-reaching an instance of State interference as any that we are acquainted with in recent times.

Let me try to make this matter of registration somewhat clearer. The old rule of law was that, when any one bought land, he could require the seller to prove his title through his predecessors for sixty years back; otherwise the purchaser could break off the contract. The reason of this was as follows. Suppose a life-interest in land is left by will early in the century to A, then a youth, with remainder to A's then unborn son, B. On coming of age in 1825, A fraudulently, or by an erroneous construction, treats himself as absolute owner, and sells the land out and out to a purchaser who does not discover the mistake. The land in due course passes by will to the purchaser's child and grandchild. The latter, about 1880, sells to C, never suspecting that he is not absolute owner of the land. Now if C's lawyers only see the documents, wills, &c., subsequent to the original purchase in 1825, they will have no means of knowing that



the title is utterly worthless, and that there is an unknown personage, A's son, entitled to enter into possession of the property and to oust everybody else from it as soon as A, now an old man, dies. This they could only ascertain by going back to the original deed of 1825, and the papers which passed with it. These would enable them to discover that A could sell no more than his own life-interest in the property. It is one of the nuisances and absurdities of our system of life-interests and limited ownerships, that, whereas a plain man buying land and reading the Statutes of Limitations would suppose that twelve years' uncontested possession would give him a good prescriptive title, the law is nothing of the kind. The rights of the possessor only accrue as against the persons at that moment entitled to claim actual possession, or those claiming directly through them. There may be someone else whose right of actual possession only begins after the extinction of a number of intermediate life-interests, and against such person the Statutes of Limitations does not begin to run until these lives are all extinct. In the instance given above, A's son has no right to claim the land till his father's death in 1885. The twelve years which must run against him in favour of the actual possessor do not begin till then; so that the representative of those who bought the land in 1825 may be turned out in 1896 by a forgotten remainderman after seventy-one years *bonâ-fide* and uninterrupted possession.

This is what the advocates of Government registration must bear in mind. It is usual in transactions between private vendors and purchasers of land not to go so far back with the title as sixty years; and among the "conditions of sale" there are almost always certain stipulations as to the date from which the title shall be deduced, and as to certain matters which are to be accepted without proof or inquiry. This is reasonable between private persons, for land would be almost unsaleable if absolute strictness in the demonstration of title were everywhere exacted. But when Government comes in and undertakes to supply every owner with an indefeasible title, and to guarantee him that, come who may, no law-court shall be entitled to listen to a single word on behalf of any adverse claim, then, in mere justice to those who may have as yet unenforceable rights, rights of which they are themselves perhaps not aware, Government will be bound to exact the utmost strictness in proof of title. Otherwise, it will either deprive a good many people of their lawful property, or, in the alternative, will burden the taxpayer with the payment of compensation to those whom its own hasty and imperfect procedure has injured. Also, if the Government too easily accepts a mere statement of possessory rights without documentary proof, we shall find, in the present deplorable state of administrative nihilism as regards all public and common lands, that Mr. Winans or some other enterprising American has enrolled and acquired an indefeasible title to Hyde Park.

There are one or two further questions which the practical mind may be pardoned for raising in connection with registration. Are all houses in London and other towns to be registered, or only land? In the former case, John Bull's bill for this little new luxury will be something almost to compare with his fighting and his drinking bills. Again, on what map or survey is the registration to be based? The new 25-inch Ordnance Map is one of the finest, if not the very finest, work of the kind ever executed. A landowner can at the expense of a few shillings purchase at the office in St. Martin's Lane a map of his estate such as no conceivable private outlay could have secured for him. Every ditch, every gate, every tree by the roadside is marked; and an area-book gives the extent of each field, corrected to the thousandth part of an acre. But this splendid work is unfortunately completed only for a small part of England. For the rest the official map is still the Tithe Survey, executed forty years ago, and so much out of date through alterations of boundaries, enclosures, and new arrangements of fields, that it is sometimes a matter of difficulty to identify the "parcels" of an estate sold with the delineation of the same in the Tithe Survey. The number by which each field is marked in the new Ordnance Map is never that by which the same field is marked in the Tithe Map; and it appears to me that there is often a considerable difference in the area given, even where the boundaries have not changed. Now to carry out the registration on the basis of the old antiquated Tithe Survey when the new Ordnance Map has come into existence would be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole thing. On the other hand, it is impossible that the Ordnance Map can be completed for many years. It appears therefore that there is no help for it, but that we must have registration by the Ordnance Map in one part of the country and registration by the Tithe Map in another; and that as the Ordnance Survey advances it will be necessary to keep up a continual process of rewriting the register, and substituting for the old Tithe numbers, boundaries, and figures those of the new Ordnance Survey.

These are some of the difficulties arising in connection with a compulsory registration of titles, the chief of them being, as I conceive, the opposition which will be offered to the process by landowners, and the extreme resistance which they will make to the payment of the heavy cost involved. In certain proposals for land-reform which I ventured to submit to the public elsewhere, after full consideration of the subject of compulsory registration I advisedly abstained from inserting it, believing the difficulties to be so great that it was better not to raise the question at all. However, Mr. Goschen, with his great parliamentary position and experience, has now declared that the thing is to be done. We must all be thankful to hear it; and if the Liberal party are wise, they will entreat Mr. Chamberlain to hold his peace while this part of the reforming programme is being

accomplished. Mr. Goschen must not be allowed to sit apart and pray, like the Mahdi, while we get our heads broken. No, he must come into the thick of the fight. "Out with your title-deeds; it is Goschen who declares to you that there is no interference with your freedom. Off with your trunks of old papers to the Town Hall; unbosom yourselves to the Commissioner; tell him all about that bit of common land which the Radicals say never belonged to your father, and the trust-deed which was interpreted in so many different ways. It is not the State interfering with you; oh no, nothing of the kind! And, wretches, is it possible that you are grumbling at the cost? Incredible! You surely cannot mean to blaspheme the principles of Gladstonian finance."

There will be work enough for Mr. Goschen and those whom he may honour with his assistance before the abolition of family-settlements and the compulsory registration of title are fairly effected. Mr. Goschen will then say that all that requires to be done has been done, and he will part company with Liberals who desire to take further steps in land-reform. We shall then enter the debateable ground on which the advocates of an improved tenure for the farmer and of the creation of a system facilitating the use or acquisition of land by labourers and villagers will be resisted by Mr. Goschen and others, who, after supporting one immense piece of State interference, will then fall back on the principle of *laissez faire*. It will be desirable that public opinion should, in the meantime, decide whether legislation is, or is not, to be confined within Mr. Goschen's limits; and the best means of assisting public opinion towards this decision will be to state what is desired by moderate reformers, who are far from assenting to the rough schemes which Mr. Goschen has attributed to them. "Beware," says Mr. Goschen, "of crude panaceas like the Three F's. They distract attention from what is really required, and they are inconsistent with one another. You cannot have both fair rents and free sales of tenant-right, for, when the incoming tenant has paid the outgoing tenant a sum for his occupancy, the interest on this sum becomes part of the rent, and, if it is too much, no authority can subsequently reduce it. You cannot, therefore, with free sales unite the power of fixing fair rents." Now, with regard to the Three F's, no one with any sort of responsible position has ever proposed them in England. The most that has been said is that reforms are necessary in the direction of the Three F's. Mr. Goschen is setting up a man of straw in order that he may have the pleasure of knocking him down; and others who know less about the matter than Mr. Goschen have belaboured the dummy with great vehemence. It so happens that in this case the man of straw has a gun under his arm, which goes off in the following manner. The favourite argument against State interference with rents is, that if rents were fixed by any public authority, landlords would cease to make improvements on their

estates, and the country would immensely suffer thereby. Now the fact that many landlords do spend largely on improvements is palpable to everybody, but what proportion do the sums spent in improvements bear to the rental of the kingdom and the capital value of the land? Sir James Caird, writing rather from the landlord's point of view, estimates the annual expenditure of landlords, during the last thirty years or so, at £2,000,000. The rental is £67,000,000; the average expenditure, therefore, is less than 3 per cent. of the rent. I declare that I was never so astonished at any fact in agricultural statistics as when I first saw Sir James Caird's estimate of the average of landlords' expenditure. I had always believed it to be at least three or four times greater; and from my own experience of land-management and a knowledge of the expenses on various persons' estates, I should have considered a man who spent no more than 3 per cent. of his rental on improvements as a most indifferent landlord. Sir James Caird estimates the capital value of the soil of the United Kingdom at £2,000,000,000. Set this by the side of the annual £2,000,000, and can there be any more telling answer to the statement that the prosperity of the country has been created by landlords' outlay? If the landlords had been spending at their present rate every year since the Norman conquest, they would not have parted with a capital sum equal to that on which they now receive rental. Moreover, buildings, roads, and drains wear out, so that of the annual £2,000,000 a good deal must be spent in mere renewals. The sum, though large in itself, which has been spent during the last thirty years in actual improvements must be much less than a single year's rental. This, however, is by the way, and is intended to show that the case of those who dwell on the all-importance of landlords' improvements is not so strong as they imagine. The State could easily have lent the tenants an equal amount of capital to make the same improvements, had the tenants' legal position been such that he could give the State valid security.

I now return to the Three F's. The contention of the advocates of a change in farmers' tenure is that capital is above all things now necessary for British agriculture, and that capital would flow into it more freely if the farmer had greater security and more complete rights of realising the results of his own skill, industry, and enterprise. I am perfectly aware that there is no class of men who are so well able to take care of themselves as farmers are individually; but there is also no class of men so little capable of combination, and so apt to prefer a trifling advantage over a neighbour to the pursuit of the general interest of their class. The best farmers acknowledge this and regret it. It is not from any illusion as to the characteristics of many of these suffering saints that I urge an improvement in their tenure, but mainly with the object of getting more capital invested in the farming business, without which

the present col-  
 however, I contend that whereas the Legislature has, in the  
 public interest, declared that tenants are to possess certain legal rights,  
 under the present conditions of tenure tenants can be, and in many  
 cases daily are, arbitrarily prevented from exercising these legal  
 rights. What, then, is demanded by practical men? That the tenant  
 should have absolute fixity in his holding? No; but that a tenant  
 receiving notice to quit should, if he believes that he is being expelled  
 merely for a capricious or oppressive motive, have the right to appeal  
 to some public authority against the expulsion. During the snow-  
 storm of last January in the north of England, I counted fifteen hares  
 on two fields on a small farm, and asked the local agent with whom  
 I was travelling whether the farmers in those parts did not know of  
 the Hares and Rabbits Act. "Yes," he said, "they know it as well  
 as you do, but they also know that it is the rule on this estate that a  
 tenant killing hares will have to leave." That is, the Legislature in  
 the public interest says that every tenant must have the right of  
 killing certain destructive creatures; but the landlord says, "If you  
 exercise the right which the law gives you, I shall turn you out  
 of your home." If this is to continue, it will be the sheerest waste  
 of time for Parliament to trouble itself any more about the Game  
 Laws. It will be mere claptrap and imposture for the Liberal party  
 to say that the tenant may do this and may do that, if the penalty  
 for his doing so is to be expulsion from his home. The only way out  
 of this is to give the tenant the right of appealing to some local  
 authority, and obtaining a reversal of the notice to quit, if he can  
 show that it is thoroughly causeless or oppressive. For any good  
 reason, whether a fault on the part of the tenant or the landlord's  
 reasonable intention to put the land to some other use, the local  
 authority would not interfere with the landlord's action.

Granting this, then we are inevitably led to something in the nature  
 of Fair Rents; for to say that a landlord may arbitrarily demand an  
 enormous rent in the case of a tenant who kills a hare is the same  
 thing as saying that he may expel him. It is useless to grant an  
 appeal against expulsion if we do not grant an appeal against an  
 extravagant raising of rent. It will probably be wise to avoid the  
 term Land Court in dealing with Fair Rents, and to suggest in its  
 place some local authority, such as a committee of the County Board,  
 which might act rather as a friendly arbitrator than as an adminis-  
 trator of law. I never could understand the repugnance which some  
 people suppose landlords would feel towards a Board for fixing rents  
 in cases of disagreement. Sydney Smith said that an Englishman  
 who had not £5,000 a year ought to apologize whenever he expressed  
 a political opinion; and I suppose that a small landowner ought  
 similarly to apologize for expressing any opinion relating to his greater  
 brethren. Having myself been haggling with a tenant for the last  
 six months about £10 more or less in his rent, I should have esteemed

it the greatest comfort to be able to go straight to some public authority and get the matter fixed, and would gladly have paid the costs on both sides. As to the statement that landlords would cease to improve their estates if rents were liable to be fixed from without, I believe that it is entirely without foundation in fact, and that those who repeat it misrepresent the feelings and habits of English landlords. No one proposes to reduce the landlord to the condition of the mere holder of a fixed rent-charge. If the rent were at any given date settled by the Board, the landlord and tenant would then be in just the same position as if they were beginning a lease with a fixed rent; and it is notorious that landlords are constantly laying out money during leases by agreement with the tenant that they shall receive a percentage on the outlay. Of course the rent fixed by the Board might similarly be raised by agreement between landlord and tenant; and of course any Board in subsequently hearing an application relating to rent would take account of the sums expended by the landlord. Whether in the case of now existing leases it is desirable that a public authority should come to the tenant's assistance is no doubt open to question. I confess that in view of the extraordinary circumstances of the last eight years, and the unprecedented disturbance of prices, it does seem to me that the State might fairly resort to exceptional action, and relieve tenants in certain cases from obligations which, through no fault of their own, it is impossible that they can fulfil without paying away their capital in rent and without impoverishing the soil. It is, however, not probable that such a measure will be proposed unless farmers should show themselves much more anxious for it than they have hitherto appeared.

To pass on to free sale of his holding by the tenant. The reason why this is demanded is that without it a tenant cannot be sure of reaping the fruit of his own well-directed expenditure and industry. The Agricultural Holdings Act does, no doubt, give the tenant compensation for various specific improvements, the measure of his compensation being the increased value given to the farm by these improvements. But no schedule of an Act of Parliament can really summarize all the modes by which a tenant may increase the value of his holding. For instance, every practical agriculturist knows that adjoining farms receive different prices for the same dairy-produce. This is because one man conducts his business better than another, and so supplies a better article. The effect is that the farm gets a high reputation, so that any one taking it is sure to have customers and connection ready-made, and thus the landlord is able to obtain a higher rent for it. In this case the Agricultural Holdings Act cannot prevent the landlord from profiting by the tenant's skill and expenditure, or even from raising the tenant's own rent because he has by his energy added to the value of the farm. Farmers are strictly within the limits of equity when they claim the right of selling their tenancy for the best that they can get for it, for

such a free sale is the only possible way in which the farmer, on leaving, can get the full reward of his work and improvements. Of course Free Sale implies that there shall be some protection against an arbitrary raising of rent. Mr. Goschen has indeed discovered that Free Sale and Fair Rent are incompatible, because the interest on the sum which is once paid by the incoming tenant can never afterwards be lowered. He might as well say that Fair Rent is incompatible with paying the outgoing tenant £100 for a good bull. Certainly the interest on the sum once paid cannot afterwards be lowered, but the incomer makes his purchase of the tenancy once for all, just as he purchases a team of carthorses, and if he makes a bad bargain no doubt he must put up with it. But the outgoing tenant cannot, like the landlord, come year after year and say, "You must give me twenty pounds more, or I will turn you out." To make Mr. Goschen's argument complete, the outgoing tenant ought to be paid, not by a fixed sum, but by an annuity liable to be increased at his own pleasure. So far from Fair Rent and Free Sale being incompatible, the latter is impossible without the former. When a tenant who has improved the value of the farm by careful husbandry, by keeping superior stock, and generally by a thousand daily business-like acts, which make all the difference to a farm, but are not and cannot be enumerated in any Agricultural Holdings Act—when such a tenant thinks of leaving the farm, he will, in the event of his unfortunately not being able to agree with his landlord, apply to the Board and get a rent settled, in which rent the difference which he has made to the farm by his own proficiency ought not to be included. At this rent he will be able to sell his holding, and the price paid him by the incomer will be the just return on his own labour and skill. Of course the landlord ought to be protected from having an unsuitable tenant thrust upon him, by the right of obtaining a decision of the Board based on any objection which he may raise against the new tenant.

Thus far in the direction of the Three F's. The first, the so-called Fixity, amounts to no more than the right of appeal when an expulsion is oppressive, capricious, or unjustifiable. The second is in essence the right of applying to a Board against an unjustifiable increase of rent; to what extent this right should be generalised is a difficult question, and will be answered differently by many who will disagree with Mr. Goschen's position that there should be no such right at all. The third, Free Sale, is a claim for the commercial and industrial principle that a man should be allowed to get the best he can for what he has himself produced. If these are crude panaceas, the moral and economical laws affecting the agricultural population of England are different from those which govern the rest of mankind.

I propose in a future article to consider the prospects of legislation in its bearing on the labourer, the small holder, and a possible peasant proprietary.

C. A. FYFFE.

## RADICAL THEORISTS ON LAND.

THERE are certain books by the best of English authors which unfortunately are put into the hands of children and read at an age when it is impossible to appreciate them. They produce, however, so much impression as to be remembered sufficiently to prevent many people reading them again when the reading would be more profitable. *Robinson Crusoe* is one of these books and *Gulliver's Travels* another. It would seem as though few people remembered the College of Inventors and Endowment of Research in the kingdom of Laputa, or surely our Radical philosophers and theorists would have hesitated before dogmatising on what they know so little of as the management of land, or imagining that improvement consists in subverting custom and doing exactly the opposite of that which our fathers have done.

Mr. Fyffe has published a lecture on the land question, and since its first publication has added an imprimatur by Sir Charles Dilke, in which Sir Charles expresses the hope that Mr. Fyffe may represent the city of Oxford. This is sufficient to explain the use of Sir Charles Dilke's name as a sanction for a pamphlet on a subject with which Sir Charles Dilke has, perhaps, even less acquaintance than his protégé. Mr. Fyffe's pamphlet is in itself an electioneering bid for the support of the more ignorant voters, of the same nature though less in degree than the publications of Mr. Henry George. Mr. Fyffe claims to have some years' experience—he does not say how many—in the management of corporate estates; but as he tells the reader in the same sentence that he possesses a small landed property of which 150 acres are thrown on his hands, it is evident that he does not practise what he preaches, namely, a sufficient reduction of rent. It is true, also, that at the outset he refers to the midlands and south-east of England, but as he goes on he writes as though his observations applied to the whole country, instead of their being of very partial application. He makes an unfortunate reference to what he imagines an intelligent foreigner would say if he travelled through these midlands and south-east of England, and appears to be ignorant of all that M. Le Play has written in praise of the English tenure and cultivation and against the instability of the French system, and the impoverishment of the French agricultural population caused by the costly intervention of the notaries at every death, and want of continuity in manufacturing industries, which rarely pass from father to son. Mr. Fyffe imagines the surprise of this foreigner at the English importing several millions' worth of various produce from France and other countries, amongst others £3,000,000 worth of poultry and eggs; yet Mr. Fyffe does not appear to know that this is chiefly owing to the differential rates in favour of the foreigner on the Kent and Sussex



railways, which have not yet been overhauled by the Railway Commission.

The first section of this pamphlet is against entails and settlements. It is a sufficient answer to all Radical arguments against these that the Bill introduced by Mr. Jesse Collings for promoting peasant proprietors provides, in clause 12, that the owner may devise in favour of one person for life, with remainder in favour of one other person; it also allows of mortgaging the entire holding. Now Mr. Jesse Collings and his coadjutors must have done this either because the nature of things requires that land should be devised to more than one person on account of the possibility of the deaths of the testator and devisee occurring simultaneously or at a very short interval, or else they have made this concession to the general feeling of all Englishmen. If so, why are these owners of small holdings to be alone favoured? This Bill has been described as a Bill to promote pauperism; it might also be described as a Bill to promote jobbery and corruption amongst local authorities, which, having been authorised to acquire any land compulsorily they may please to select, are to be authorised by clause 53 to sell or dispose of, in any way they think proper, any superfluous lands, or lands that they may be unable profitably to apply for the purposes of the Act. Another door is opened to speculation by subsection 6 of clause 8, by which the local authority may purchase any yeoman holding at any time for any purpose of public improvement or building purposes, with payment for improvements and 10 per cent. for compulsory sale, subsection 3 having already laid down that the price given to the original owner, two-thirds of which may be advanced by the local authority, should be a reasonable price. When land is going a-begging, what man in his senses would buy land from a local authority, which, besides being fettered by so many conditions, may be taken from him at any moment. The only good part of the Bill, or rather the only good intention of the Bill, namely, the facilitating the purchase of their holdings by tenants from landlords willing to sell, would be much better and more easily carried out by parliamentary power being given to the Land Improvement Company (which acts under the Land Commissioners, and is a *quasi* Government office) to grant loans to tenants towards completing the price of their farms. It is not necessary to bring the expensive machinery of a local authority for this purpose to every district; all landlords willing to sell to their tenants would know of the existence of the Land Improvement Company, and would arrange matters with them for their tenants; and in such cases the prices to tenants would be almost certain to be reasonable, as the holdings would probably not be offered to them if there were any higher bidders in the neighbourhood. Ten years ago there were a considerable number of freeholders occupying their own land in a district I am acquainted with, now only two remain, and one of them is in a poor way.

To return to the question of entail and settlements, to read Radical

theories on the subject one would think they knew nothing of Lord Cairns' Settled Estates and Conveyancing Improvement Acts of 1882. Mr. Fyffe alludes to the first only to misrepresent it entirely. He says it makes it easier for a tenant for life to deal with his property by sale or otherwise, but that if there are trustees with powers of sale, the tenant has to get their consent. This is by no means the fact: the Act gives the power of sale and leasing; the trustees' consent is not required except in special cases, such as the sale of a mansion. All they have to do is to see that the proceeds of the sale are reinvested for the remainder-man. This Act so entirely overrides entails and settlements of land that solicitors are receiving complaints from their clients against the stringency of this Act. Clause 51 makes void any provision of a settlement, will, or other instrument executed before or after the passing of the Act purporting or attempting to prevent a tenant for life exercising any power under the Act.

The Conveyancing Improvement Act has shortened conveyances and reduced solicitors' charges to the lowest limit compatible with the necessary definitions and identification of land. Removing one's neighbour's landmark is a practice not confined to the ancient Israelites, and tenants holding under different owners sometimes innocently remove fences, to the subsequent detriment of one or other of the owners. As to Mr. Fyffe's wish that mortgages and charges should be registered, I do not see any objection to it, except that it has been tried and found to be a failure. His objection to mortgages in the abstract may be answered by the fact that Mr. Jesse Collings' Bill provides for them, and therefore recognises their necessity or convenience. The great exaggeration of the complaints made against settlements even before the passing of Lord Cairns' Acts is shown by the following statement made by a friend of the writer's. Some of the figures given go to disprove other allegations of Mr. Fyffe and his friends as to labourers, on subsistence, wages, and other matters.

When this gentleman came into possession of estates of a total value of about £20,000 a year, nearly all of which were in strict settlement, he found them encumbered to the amount in round numbers of £140,000. Notwithstanding that they were strictly settled, he was able long before the passing of the Act of 1882 to sell portions of the settled estate, and to reduce the encumbrances to about £20,000. During fifteen years £8,969 was expended over a portion of the property of a yearly rental of nearly £11,000, in erecting two new farmhouses and buildings, rebuilding some fifteen farmhouses, enlarging and improving farmhouses and buildings, rebuilding eight cottages, exclusive of cost of repairs by labourers on the estate; and £2,054 on the restoration of eight churches connected with the property.

On one estate, about 3,200 acres are divided into 141 holdings; of these 46 are over 20 acres, 39 under 20 acres, 6 holdings of land

only, and about 50 cottages with gardens only. Of these tenants, 30 began life as labourers, and some are so still. These 30 holdings comprise 728 acres, divided as follows: 74 acres, 70, 60, 50, 50, 48, 48, 43, 40, 38, 34, and the rest of smaller quantities. Seven of the tenants holding the largest of these farms got on by their own thrift, industry, and good management. Three others got money with their wives; but this indicates thrift on the part of their fathers-in-law, who were not of a different class from themselves. On an adjoining estate, eight tenants holding about 220 acres among them began life as labourers.

Mr. Fyffe attributes the migration of labourers to the towns to the miserable life which they lead and the absence of any means of bettering their position. It is rather due to the greater attractions and allurements of town life, as well as to the higher wages; but there is reason to doubt whether many agricultural labourers have left the country for the towns, and whether those who have flocked into the towns are not rather village artisans whose industry was no longer flourishing. Mr. Fyffe says that, though a million acres have been turned into grass, there is no increase in the number of cattle. Apparently he has never heard of cattle plague and foot-and-mouth disease, and that till last session no serious attempt was made by the Government to prevent its free introduction from abroad. He says probably £100,000,000 at least is required to set pastoral farming on a satisfactory footing. This is very wild talk. Does he want £100,000,000 to stock the million acres withdrawn from corn, and to slightly increase the existing stock on the old pastures? and did he remember that £100,000,000 is nearly double the whole rents of Great Britain, agricultural rent and ground rent together?

Some others of the extreme philosophers propose that the right of the individual to hold land should be limited in extent; in other words, they would prohibit the existence of large estates. Considering that the great estates are the best managed and the lowest rented, that on them the tenants hold from father to son; and that the proposal to limit estates would lead to the reduction in size of farms, few farmers will agree with them. The proportion of land held in large estates in England has been as much exaggerated by Mr. Bright as the capacity of a hare's stomach compared with that of a sheep used to be by that gentleman. A letter in the *Morning Post* of February 4, dealing with the ignorance of Mr. Bright and Mr. Chamberlain of other matters than manufactures, reminds the public of Mr. Bright having said that one hare per acre was a proper allowance, which should not be exceeded. I remember it was said, but I am not sure that Mr. Bright was the author of the saying. I calculate that, on a property where there is a good show of hares, and coursing meetings take place, there are about three hundred hares at the beginning of the shooting season and about one  $\frac{1}{2}$  at the end of it, or

thirteen acres to one hare. More than Mr. Bright's allowance may sometimes be found in particular spots of grass fields, but that is a proof of the goodness of the pasture and aspect of the land. Twenty-seven hares were killed last year on a shooting of about one thousand acres, where there is no keeper; this was thought very good.

The quantity of land continually advertised for sale in the *Times*, in quantities of all dimensions, shows that land is not so scarce or so difficult to get as these writers pretend. Large quantities of land are also continually offered for sale in the provinces without appearing in the *Times* advertisements. The scarcity of land is therefore neither a valid excuse nor the real motive for the desire to interfere with property and with the freedom of the individual. Large estates and large country houses generally go together; there may be large estates without country houses, but a large country house without an estate would be an absurdity and comparatively useless. That was the reason why Lord Cairns agreed to the proposal made by Lord Granville to add to the Settled Estates Act the power to sell a mansion with the consent of the trustees, as the house would be of little use after the land had gone.

On the other hand, the general feeling is that large country houses are beneficial. They are a source of enjoyment to many others besides their owners; they are centres of civilisation or of culture in rural districts, and centres of expenditure beneficial to their neighbourhood. The Legislature has recognised and given effect to this view by passing what is called the Montgomery Act for Scotland, to encourage landowners to build residences by allowing them to borrow money on the estate to the amount of three years' rent of the estate. In 1870 an Act was passed on the model of the Montgomery Act for Ireland, but allowing of charging only two instead of three years' rent on the estate for the purpose of building a residence. It is only necessary to look at Ireland to see the bad effects of too small a number of large country houses. The disturbed state of that country has emptied most of the country houses it possessed, and has been the cause that no one has taken advantage of the Act above referred to; and if Mr. Parnell's threats are carried out, the country will relapse materially as well as morally into the state of barbarism which existed in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Among all the Radical theorists, the palm for ignorance, malice, and predatory suggestions belongs to the writer of the article in the January number of this Review called "The Revolution of 1884." He proposes that local authorities should be able to purchase any land at a "fair value." He then defines a "fair value" as that which a "willing seller" would take from a "willing purchaser." This proposal means that the local authority should take land for any purpose of public utility at a "fair value" from an unwilling seller, or at the same price that would satisfy a willing seller.

Mansions, he says, should be rated at the price at which the owners would be willing to sell them, so that they would be, as he says, "docketted" with the legitimate market price for purposes both of taxation and expropriation. And what are these objects of public utility? Not railways or objects of national interest, but experiments such as those contemplated in Mr. Jesse Collings' Bill, for which there is plenty of room in the country without interfering with private rights, and destroying what is most beautiful and most worth preserving in the rural parts of England.

Mr. Fyffe is a reactionary by the side of this revolutionist, for he says he would not injure the prospect at Blenheim or sacrifice the woods of Nuneham; or is it that the voters at Oxford are more cultured and less envious than those of Birmingham. This proposal to oblige owners to fix themselves the rates on their houses and land at the utmost limit to avoid expropriation is hardly worthy of a writer with any sense of what is due to himself or to a serious public. It looks as if it was imitated from a suggestion for replenishing the Exchequer in Joe Miller or some such repository of jokes, that men should be taxed according to the value they held in their own estimation. This would be an excellent way of fairly adjusting the balance of taxation in Mr. Chamberlain's case, since quite recently he said he was not taxed sufficiently, as he only paid 6 per cent. in taxation on his income, most likely his net income. This discovery of his—for he treated it as a discovery—ought to open his eyes and the eyes of others to the injustice with which a far larger percentage is levied on the gross income of landowners and tenant farmers, whilst manufacturers, who contribute far less to poor-rates, and next to nothing to highway rates, are allowed to make all sorts of deductions for repairs and wear and tear. Also owners and occupiers; and occupiers pay income-tax upon tithes, just as if these were their own property of which they made a free gift to the Church, which tithes are again subject to onerous taxation when they reach the hands of the clergy.

With regard to restitution of lands said to be taken from the public, it is not necessary to say anything here, as enough has been said by those evening papers which, though usually irreconcilably opposed, have joined their forces against this doctrine of Mr. Chamberlain's, as they had already done with regard to the lamentable state of the navy. An observation may, however, be made with regard to pieces of land by the roadside which have been enclosed. These bits of land never belonged to the public, but belong to the lord of the manor; and they were not waste, but wasted land; and if it is a benefit to mankind to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, it is a benefit to bring them into cultivation. Mr. Chamberlain ought to know that it is now illegal to turn cattle into a road, because it makes the cattle in the fields go wild and break

through the fences. In Wales the Crown, as lord of the manor; claims all the waste land; and if a farmer encloses any small portion not wanted for traffic by the side of the road, the Office of Woods and Forests makes his landlord pay for it, and the cost of their conveyance is six times the price charged for the land taken into cultivation.

Mr. Fyffe's pamphlet also goes into the question of building leases, and with regard to this a rather singular phenomenon has occurred. The Foreign Office has lately attracted to itself much attention and some animadversion for its neglect of its own business or foreign affairs, even when its attention had been repeatedly called to them by Prince Bismarck. It has, however, taken interest in home or domestic politics, for, from a Blue Book issued about the close of last year, it appears that her Majesty's representatives abroad were instructed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inquire into and furnish information as to the system of tenure of dwelling houses in the countries in which they reside, for the use of the House of Commons, and nine questions were sent out, principally with regard to building leases. The information obtained is interesting, but it is to be hoped that the queries for which answers were required were prompted by Mr. Broadhurst, and that the Foreign Office was not so simple as to expect to find a condition of things which has grown up by degrees under English law in countries such as Servia, Greece, and others from which Montenegro has been omitted. We find that annual payments and chief rents in perpetuity are to be found in Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Norway, Finland, the Baltic provinces, and Turkey. In Spain, since 1842, rent contracts are stated to "*have been free from all improper interference on the part of the law.*" In Finland we find our old friend the compound householder. In Poland almost all the land and houses are said to be mortgaged at 5 per cent. Something similar to English building leases exists in Sweden in the neighbourhood of towns, seaside and summer resorts, where the usual ground lease is for a term of fifty years; also in Finland, the Baltic provinces, France, and Turkey. What Sir John Walsham writes with regard to building leases in France is worth quoting, as it explains the principle of building leases, and from the short terms of leases in Paris seems to show that they are natural and convenient in places of great commercial activity.

"With respect to the length of the leases when property is let for building purposes, on condition that the houses at the end of the term become the property of the landlord, it is usual to calculate it on the probable income to be derived from the houses. The calculation is based on the principle that the lessee should not only obtain an annual income varying from 4 to 6 per cent. of the capital expended, but that the money laid out on the buildings should be redeemed.

"It would be very difficult to fix an average for the duration of this kind of lease, much depending on the commercial, industrial, and social conditions of a particular locality.

"In Paris there is land which has been let on good terms for the period of thirty years. Large dwelling-houses have been built upon it, which have realised excellent profits for the lessees, and are now doing the same for the landlords, into whose hands the houses have come. As a general rule, however, building leases of this category exceed thirty years."

Mr. Fyffe is indignant at the speculative builder; he must mean an impecunious builder, for Messrs. Cubitt, Trollope, Waller, and others are speculative builders, and without them people would have a long time to wait for their houses. If Mr. Fyffe had employed a surveyor he would not have suffered from the delays of the five firms of solicitors; also their costs must have fallen on the builder, not on him. It has been pointed out to me by a solicitor of considerable experience of leasehold property that—

"Mr. Fyffe's case with the speculative builder happens exactly the same, only on a more extensive scale, with regard to freeholders, because in many cases the builders borrow money to pay for freehold land *before they have spent one penny upon it*, whereas by taking a lease they save the necessity of finding any money until their buildings are commenced. They are an objectionable class to deal with, but the country would hardly get on without them. They have certainly tended to provide a better class of house outside the towns, and have built on a scale which capitalists would never have ventured on."

It may be added that where the leasehold property is of any extent, the lessor probably in all cases takes care to check and supervise the plans of the speculative builder; for my part, in the case of dwellings for working people, I have usually required something better than the measurements required by the Land Commissioners for cottages built by loans under their sanction. Those who object to building leases should read very sensible papers in vol. xvii. of the *Transactions of the Surveyors' Institution*; by Mr. Howard Martin and Mr. Robert Mann, in which the latter shows how the present system may be gradually altered without violent breach of contract.

Another proposal of the theorists is that every cottager should have an acre of land. This shows how impractical and ignorant the theorists are of the subject they write upon. An acre is too much or too little; it is too little to keep a cow, and far too large for a garden; to cultivate a garden of that size would take the cottager too much time. In those parts of the country where every cottage has a garden, the gardens are mostly about one-eighth of an acre in size, and the labourers have Saturday afternoons to attend to them. A landlord whose cottage gardens are of one-eighth of an acre in extent, informed his cottagers that he would enlarge their gardens from the adjoining farmland, for any that asked for more land; out of some hundreds, he only got two or three applications, and he became convinced that one-eighth of an acre is the most suitable size for a cottage garden. Ignorance of agricultural matters on the part of the city-bred reformers is perhaps most displayed in the proposition that pleasure parks taken out of cultivation should be heavily taxed; "substantially" is the word

used, but as parks are already generally throughout the country rated above their value as agricultural land, any increase of taxation would be heavy and unjust. But the great mistake is to suppose that parks do not contribute their full quota and fully do their duty in the business of land to produce food. If there are any which do not serve as leys or public pastures taking in the surplus stock for which there is not room on the farms, and providing bulls for them, it must be that the land is too poor to be used as pasture. Here Mr. Jesse Collings' Bill again comes to the rescue; for as he wishes to establish more public pastures, he cannot logically join with those who would wish to tax heavily those which already exist, and which in the present state of depression are not too profitable, as they require manure and lime dressing as much as pasture fields of smaller dimensions.

Although my opinions as to the advantages of the English system of tenure and cultivation have not been arrived at without comparison with what I have seen in many countries of Europe and Asia, yet they may not be considered as impartial, and I am glad to be able to cite the foregoing remarks, the observations of a tenant farmer, which are written from another standpoint<sup>1</sup>:—

“Few subjects occupy so much attention at the present time as ‘agriculture,’ its various relations to the landlord, the tenant, the labourer, and to the nation at large. And although so important, how few who write on this subject have a thorough practical knowledge of their own. When one has to be guided by the opinion of others how difficult is it to get at the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is said there is nothing more deceptive than figures without a practical knowledge of the subject to which they refer. This is strongly illustrated by the enormous sums of money lost in speculations of different kinds through the dishonest reports and statements of people who live on their unfortunate dupes. I would also ask readers to think for a moment how many young gentlemen they have known who have been misguided and have embraced entirely wrong ideas from articles written on the subject of agriculture; have spent a few of their most valuable years, and afterwards given the pursuit up in disgust, finding it quite different to what they had been led to expect. I have heard and read a great deal lately how our would-be reformers would turn topsy-turvy all our well-tried and time-honoured customs, and would enact in their stead some of the wildest ideas that one could well imagine. They tell us that all entails and settlements in land ought to be abrogated.

“I would ask theorists of this school to calmly look round and make personal inquiries from tenants on ‘unsettled’ estates—those who have the misfortune to have had their farms severed from a large

(1) These remarks, I may say, are the independent criticisms of an Anglesey farmer, which, at my request, Lord Stanley has incorporated in his paper.—ED. F. R.



previously entailed estate and are now the tenants of enterprising men of business, who may have bought the property and are determined to have as much interest for their money as it is possible to screw out of the tenant. It may be and frequently is the case that the tenant and his forefathers have lived for generations on the farm, and not unfrequently have it in a very good state of cultivation, with buildings, fences, and drains made mostly at their own expense, and in other ways comfortably circumstanced. It is the cries from not a few of this class who are being reduced to poverty that have no doubt attracted the attention of some kind and well-disposed people who are being misled into the idea that the fault is entail or settlement:

"Happily the law of entail is still the statute law of this kingdom. Should it ever be abrogated, instead of a gradual increase in production, as has been going on for years, we should find fewer and fewer who would care to devote their time and energies to agriculture, and what is now becoming a science would gradually but surely drift away, and our production fall back to what it was in years gone by.

"The craze about small holdings, it was thought, had well-nigh been only a theory of the past, but seeing that it is still cherished by some, I may as well just give it a passing glance, although I have little doubt it has gone for ever. In my humble opinion theorists who have entertained this notion had been attracted by seeing small plots cultivated near our large towns and cities, and have said to themselves, 'If they will pay there why not pay everywhere?' little thinking of the thousand obstacles in the way of transporting such produce in such a state as would command a market. It is most absurd to say that land will produce more to a labourer than to an experienced farmer, who has been taught and has studied his business. A labourer is employed to do his portion of the work, while the farmer has to do the most important part, viz. buying and selling, selecting and taking proper care of stock and seeds, and to regulate scores of other things required for the proper working of the farm. In the county of Anglesey, where we have a quantity of small holdings—the tenants of which are, as a rule, now reduced, and in some cases worse fed and clad than a pauper—the small holder, having to remain at home to do the combined duties of labourer, has little or no knowledge of the market value of the article he has to sell, hence the disadvantage at which he is placed. As to fixity of tenure to the cultivator, in his visit to a large entailed estate I would ask the reader to inquire from the tenants how long their family have held the farm. I venture to say that he would find some who cannot go back to the time when his family first came, and he can find some who are paying exactly the same rent as their forefathers paid sixty to eighty years ago. Not so with the 'unsettled' estate tenants. More can be found who have not been on their farms ten years, and during that period have had their rents advanced twice or thrice.

"I do not say that the present settlements could not be improved; I believe they could. I believe that landlords of settled estates ought to have wider bounds in the granting of leases, &c., to worthy tenants for longer periods than twenty-one years. A young, energetic man taking to a farm, going in for extensive improvements, will find the twenty-one years gone before he has finished his improvements, leaving out of the question repayment for his outlay. On the other hand, as is often the case when a farmer dies, his son gets the first offer of the farm, and generally takes it. Should he turn out to be a worthless man and neglect his farm, what a hardship to a landlord to be compelled to allow him to go on in his idle ways, and what a loss to the nation through the production of such a farm being decreased! If we have fixity of tenure, what is to prevent this? Some landlords spoke strongly in favour of the Agricultural Holdings Act because it recommended itself as more economical, while at the same time it was supposed to protect the tenants. Tenants have been known to do large building improvements on the strength of it, only to find that the landlord, by way of excuse, did not approve of the materials used, and so get out of his responsibility. Tenants now see that it is much preferable to get materials as was the old custom when they had no intention or expectation of leaving. Under the Ground Game Act the most, in fact the only, destructive game is under the control of the tenant, so that if these do him any damage it is his own fault. Of late a system of letting the game to sportsmen for the sake of, say, a shilling an acre at the utmost, and without offering it to the tenant, who ought to have the first offer to rent it; but if, on the other hand, the landlord and his friends care for the sport, no one would be more welcome, or find in the tenant a better game preserver. Having offered some suggestions on the relation of landlord and tenant, I should like to say a few words on the laying out of farms with cottages necessary for the labourer and his family. Except near towns, the most convenient size for a mixed farm is sixty to seventy acres, which requires the same quantity of horses and implements as if half the size. When above seventy acres it requires two pairs of horses to do the ordinary work of a farm of one hundred and fifty to two hundred acres. For a farm of seventy acres one cottage will do as a rule, and for the larger farm you require two or three. Our cottagers' wages as a rule are 8s. to 11s. per week in cash. He is fed at the farmhouse, and has his cottage and about one-fourth of an acre of garden, which is quite ample, and as much as he can keep in order without neglecting his duty to his employer, to grow a few early potatoes, vegetables, and odds and ends. He is also allowed to plant a sack of potatoes, or as much as will produce a cartload, the farmer supplying the manure, the land, and the cultivation except weeding, and frequently paying him to assist his wife and family to gather the crop. In some places he is still allowed to keep

a sheep or two, or have a cow's grass with less wages; this custom is gradually dying out. They purchase milk and butter, but frequently get the buttermilk, as well as straw under their pigs, free.

"My attention has lately been directed to two other absurd notions. In few words, they propose to inflict a fine on the landowner who happens to possess a good grazing park if he won't half ruin it by ploughing it up. We have a few in this county, and would gladly welcome more. To plough these up would be a national loss; they produce the finest quality of beef and mutton, which is always saleable at remunerative prices. If they were cultivated most likely they would produce good crops for a time, but these would not realise so much as beef or mutton, and if we had a wet season it might not make half so much. This notion is clearly one of jealousy and ill-feeling, and we are inclined to think that it ought to be placed in the same category as the restoration to the public of all lands that have been taken from them. I am inclined to think that commons, wherever situated, ought by all means to be enclosed; the duty of the apportionment ought to be undertaken by the local authority. Immediately the lots have been settled, the owners of common rights ought at once to fence them in and cultivate them. Should they neglect to do this a heavy tax might be imposed. With regard to the production of corn in this country, I thought it was a universally admitted fact that the less we grow the better, if the land is at all suitable for grazing. Carriage of grain at this moment is as little from the remotest country to London as it is from here. Heavy railway rates are another great drawback to farmers; but notwithstanding this, and the constant cry that is made, our great reformers won't help us, but if any taxes are required put them on the land and buildings. Land is asked to keep and educate the poor; our immense shipping interest and other commercial traffic are not asked to contribute a farthing. I believe our legislators have too much good sense to swallow such ideas. They need not go far to be convinced of their fallacy. Unfortunately too few of the farming class venture to put pen to paper. For one reason we have not the ability, and for another we wish to live peaceably with all men."

Last session, in the House of Lords, the Government gave their personal honour as a pledge that certain promises would be fulfilled. They will, however, allow the value of that pledge to be depreciated if they continue to tolerate the utterance of predatory suggestions by some of their number, and the support and countenance by others of them of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, now that Mr. Goschen has called their attention to the wilful deviations from truth put forth by that Association in its almanac.

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY.

## THE LIFE OF GEORGE ELIOT.<sup>1</sup>

It is pleasant to think that of one of our great English writers we at last have a truly faithful picture—one wherein no man can find offence, and with which her spirit may rest in peace undisturbed. The Life which her husband has given to the world is worthy of George Eliot; it is such a life as she, with her instinctive dread of biographies, would have chosen to leave behind her, and it recalls with curious fidelity the mind and spirit of the original.

Loving reverence has drawn a likeness which no literary art could have produced, and which the more familiar kinds of literary art would have cruelly spoiled. In form the book is new, so new and so successful in its method as perhaps to promise a new type of biography. It is an autobiography, not composed by the biographer herself, but put together out of letters, diaries, and notes extending over forty-two years, connected by so much narrative as the editor thought needful to give unity to the whole. But of the entire work of some fourteen hundred pages, there are hardly fifty by the editor himself, and these are in the same type and quietly blended with the journals and letters. The letters again appear, not in the too familiar way, in small type, solemnly copied from. "Dear Sir," to "Yours truly," looking for all the world like fossil shells in the chalk cliff of the editorial big print, but they appear as fragments of autobiography, duly pruned of mere frivolities, the margin alone disclosing the date, the occasion, and the person addressed.

The Life so composed is in every sense an autobiography, yet it is free from the defects natural to all autobiographies. When a man writes his own life he is *ex hypothesi* posing before posterity, and even if he has the humane serenity of Hume, or the Spartan simplicity of Mill, he will be just a little conscious, though it be but to add one touch more to his habitual *insouciance* or to his constitutional reticence. And then, an autobiography has always the serious defect of describing events and impressions at a great distance as seen through memory alone, when the interests of the years gone by are pale and the very character has changed. An autobiography is the tale of his youth that an old man tells to his descendants. There is something a little artificial in the effort of memory to recollect the past; something a little artificial in the effort to present his reputation to the future. And none but the finest natures have succeeded in the task. A journal is too often a thin and jerky instrument to use, and is seldom that wherein men present their best thoughts in their happiest tones. It is too often a receptacle of wayward ideas which the writer half trusts may

(1) *George Eliot's Life, as related in her Letters and Journals.* Arranged and edited by her Husband, J. W. Cross. Blackwood. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 1885.

never be read, and half hopes will look mellow if seen through the softening effect of time.

Cart-ropes and wild horses would never have drawn out of George Eliot a deliberate autobiography. Her journal is a simple record of facts, without any profusion of thought or careful recording of feeling. Yet in these pages we have after all a real autobiography, of which she has been the unconscious author. The letters, journals, and notes record the growth of the mind from month to month during forty years, and that without any sense of secrecy in the writing on the one hand, or any idea of publication on the other. It is a process which one would hardly wish to see generally applied to the letters of famous persons. No one would like to have Byron's letters so woven into consecutive narrative, nor could Scott's life be duly written by means of his private correspondence. George Eliot's can be, and thus the book before us is a strangely realistic presentation of herself. Not perchance of herself within, as she and some one or two may have known all that lay underneath the reticent self-communion of her heart, but of that outward self which the world saw. Of all that even her intimate friends saw this book is, I think, the true and sufficient record.

So faithful a record that to many of her friends it will have the effect of illusion. One can almost fancy that it is a posthumous work of her own; that she is not only the subject, but the sole author of the Life. The very form of the page, the symmetry, the care and exceeding thoughtfulness, the felicitous citation of a motto or a phrase, the no less felicitous illustrations of face and home, all curiously recall the inexhaustible thirst after perfection which gave us *Romola*. What art did there, love in a sense has done here, and in the measured chastened pages of her familiar letters, in the ever-meditating mood, in the unflinching grasp upon philosophy and science, in the almost oppressive spirit of conscientious work, in the almost morbid dislike of scandal, unkindness, mere babble and mere fashion, the book is her book, not a book about her. We who knew her can hear in it her very tones, recall the gesture with which she spoke this or that sentence. Her shadowy hand seems to have guided the pen of the compiler, and her spirit to have informed his judgment, as the heap of time-discoloured writings, treasured by many a friend and unknown to the world without, grew beneath his hand into a clear and continuous Life.

Those who have been accustomed to lively anecdotes, interspersed with cutting bits of personal satire, may possibly find these volumes wanting in amusement. As was happily said the other day, some readers like *Truth* better than the truth. They are certainly not good reading for those who are surfeited on the memoirs of court favourites or party politicians. They are like her books, like herself, "sober, steadfast, and demure." The true note of *Penseroso* is heard in them

throughout: "o'erlaid with black, staid wisdom's hue," "with even step, and musing gait." So she was in life, so in her letters, so also in her tales, the thought almost overpowering the expression; the expression finished, and right in art, but withal not wholly spontaneous, often wanting in *brio*, in rapidity of *scherzo* passages, not seldom in the mood of Beethoven in his least effective manner. And yet, like the master, how weighty, full, and satisfying to the thoughtful mind!

These letters are the record of a purely literary life, as her life was, and such is the only record which as a rule the public have a right to ask about famous writers. As a record of mental growth, methods of work, canons of art, the book is complete. Those who expect to find in it passion, storm, romance, and all the maze of antipathies, loves, quarrels, and struggles which make up so much of many famous literary memoirs, are likely to suffer disappointment. It may be doubted if there ever was much of these things woven in the life of George Eliot, and certainly it may be doubted if even her most intimate friends have anything thereon that they could faithfully record. There is little enough of such a sort to be gleaned from the letters. Nor need we suppose that any written line of hers survives which would tell us more. All letters to Mr. George Lewes she deliberately burnt after his death. They were meant for one eye, and the world had no business with them. But of the sobs and the spasms which so often fill the lives of men of letters how little is there here! The sobs and the spasms are perhaps for the most part of the subjective order, wonderfully magnified by the literary sensibility, and coloured by that egoism of romance which besets the masters of the pen. It may be a useful lesson to those who are prone to admire the Confessions and the Autobiographical Musings of some men of genius to see how a woman, in genius their equal, in sensibility their superior, measures out her words from the "fixed mind" to her intimate friends and alike in her private diary, neither cursing fate, nor her acquaintances, scorning random slander, too proud to exhibit her heart in a glass case, her mind so busy with the greater things that there is but small room for the personal and the trivial.

As enjoyable letters, tried by the highest literary type, there is too little perhaps of the personal and the trivial. They want the idyllic simplicity of Cowper, the wicked wit of Charles Lamb, the abounding vitality of Byron; nor have they the whispering charm of the letters of some women far her inferiors. But they are fine letters; full of goodness, truthfulness, thought, originality; very carefully written, without an idle or an evil word. George Eliot did not disdain either the personal or the trivial; she dealt with both in the same patient and dutiful temper she brought to greater things. Only she found personalities and trivialities too sorry subjects to be dignified with paper and pen. *Perituræ parcere chartæ*, was her motto in their case; she would not waste paper and ink in recording

them. And the giddy world which likes nothing better than these flies in amber is far from pleased. George Eliot, it turns out, was a much more accomplished housewife than Jane Austen, but she does not gossip on in Jane's delicious way about cookmaids and village matchmaking, the neighbours' frocks, and young Frank's awkwardness at a ball. There is plenty of the kind in George Eliot's novels; but this is the observant imagination of the artist. It does not enter into her life, colour her private correspondence, or supply salt and seasoning to her literary Remains.

It is not a little curious also how very small a part of the correspondence has literature as its subject or is exchanged with men of letters. Except a complimentary letter or two from Dickens, Bulwer, and one or two letters to Miss Martineau and Mrs. Stowe, there is in these three volumes hardly any correspondence whatever with authors. And this is the more remarkable as George Eliot was in social relations with almost every well-known name of her time in literature, science, and art. Almost all her letters are addressed to intimate friends, not to companions in letters; with very few exceptions to women, and most of them friends of very long standing. The subject of them is in the main such things as a very thoughtful woman finds most interesting to the women she loves:—the happiness of friends, the duties of friendship performed or planned for the future, the moral problems of life, the new knowledge acquired, the progress of the family, the influence of scenes, books, or characters on the spirit, the yearning after rest and some clearer insight into the tangle of destiny. George Eliot's are not the letters of the critic, of the humourist, of the wit, of the painter of manners, or the painter of character. The substance of them is the serious outpouring of heart common in close friendship, home affections, home cares, conscientious work; all rendered solemn by moral and philosophic flashes such as strike us, like the forked lightning, in *Silas Marner*, or *Romola*, or the *Spanish Gypsy*.

What a record of unflinching mental training do these volumes present! How touching is the little inscription in *The Linnet's Life*, "the first book that George Eliot read." "It made me very happy," she wrote, "when I held it in my little hand, and read it over and over again." The child of five, who began the art of reading over and over again with the *Linnet's Life*, persevered in study through life, till the whole range of the best literature, both ancient and modern, was hers. With a scientific knowledge of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, the four continental languages, and a complete familiarity with all that is best in our own literature, she combined not a little science; some mathematics, some astronomy, physics, botany, and biology. In the higher philosophy she spent some twelve years in the opening of her literary life. She only took up the pen to write a novel, when she was already one of the most accomplished minds

of her time. In these new volumes we have a sufficient record of the gradual acquisition of this great learning. It differs indeed from the casual reading of the omnivorous bookman. It has none of that restless consumption of print which too often is mistaken for learning. It is rather the systematic study of subjects. There go to form it a careful selection of the best; exclusion of the trivial; and an admirable balance of art, science, and philosophy.

How different this from the critic's sipping of new books as they come all fresh from the binder! It is rather the older than the new books which George Eliot reads. She reads more to complete a certain branch of knowledge, than to savour a particular writer. Her studies are not so eclectic but what they are controlled by a deep philosophy; and we see them all falling into their due place in an orderly scheme of knowledge. Art holds its true place as the interpreter of Truth, but not her guide. Science is not shunned as if it were a skeleton on wires, something unseemly in the home of the beautiful. And in her wise and far-reaching vision philosophy is the constant guide of life and knowledge. In this completeness of range and solid harmony of culture George Eliot represented to our age something of that gospel of which Goethe was the older prophet.

Real culture such as hers is a far more solid thing than those airy acquirements which often usurp the name. George Eliot's culture was knowledge harmonized by artistic instinct, and deepened by an abiding moral glow. Culture is too often supposed to be attainable by fine critical taste, and a curious felicity in pirouetting around many things. To her science, philosophy, social ideals were the substance of culture; the graceful form and the critical judgment were the instrument by which it speaks. "Her gratitude," she writes, "increases continually for the illumination contributed to her life,"—by one whom, strangely enough, the higher criticism pronounces after all to be "a grotesque old French pedant." But Culture and Criticism too often see men and things in a very different light. Just so, Bossuet saw things differently from those charming *abbés* of the Regency who taught *belles lettres*, and many other matters, to the "*belles marquises*" of the day. On the whole we shall most of us prefer the Culture of George Eliot, with its ordered scheme of knowledge, its hold on moral life and scientific philosophy, to that peripatetic Culture which always finds Science and Philosophy too hard to understand; and which in the meantime goes hopping about, like a well-preserved Ariel, from flower to flower, and from continent to continent, as Barnum waves his magic wand.

After all that has been written about George Eliot's place as an artist, it may be doubted if attention has been properly directed to her one unique quality. Whatever be her rank amongst the creators of romance (and perhaps the tendency now is to place it too high rather than too low), there can be no doubt that she stands entirely



apart and above all writers of fiction, at any rate in England, by her philosophic power and general mental calibre. No other English novelist has ever stood in the foremost rank of the thinkers of his time. Or to put it the other way, no English thinker of the higher quality has ever used romance as an instrument of thought. Our greatest novelists could not be named beside her off the field of novel-writing. Though some of them have been men of wide reading, and even of special learning, they had none of them pretensions to the best philosophy and science of their age. Fielding and Goldsmith, Scott and Thackeray, with all their inexhaustible fertility of mind, were never in the higher philosophy compeers of Hume, Adam Smith, Burke, and Bentham. But George Eliot, before she wrote a tale at all, in mental equipment stood side by side with Mill, Spencer, Lewes, and Carlyle. If she produced nothing in philosophy, moral or mental, quite equal to theirs, she was of their kith and kin, of the same intellectual quality. Her conception of Sociology was quite as profound as that of Mill, and in some ways keener in insight; if Lewes knew more of psychology or biology, she could teach him much in history and in morals. There are in *Silas Marner*, *Adam Bede*, and the *Spanish Gypsy*, volcanic bursts of prophetic teaching which Teufelsdröckh never surpassed. That is to say, George Eliot, who at her death left no living novelist to be mentioned beside her, was all her life in intellectual fellowship with the first philosophic minds of her day.

Turn it the other way. None of our English thinkers of the first, second, or even third rank, have resorted to romance as a vehicle of thought. The only possible exceptions that occur to me are Swift, Dr. Johnson, and Miss Martineau; but *Gulliver*, *Rasselas*, and *Deerbrook* are romances only by courtesy for their authors. Abroad there have been examples of men of foremost intellectual force who have written novels. Of these one only—Goethe—has written a true novel in a vein worthy of himself. And it is to *Wilhelm Meister* that we may most aptly go for analogues to the George Eliot cycle of novels. Of course, as poet, as a secular force of European rank, Goethe himself stands apart. But in his *Wilhelm Meister* we have those meditations upon life, human nature, and society, that supreme culture, and a certain Shakespearean way of looking down upon the world as from a vantage-ground afar, which again and again recur in George Eliot and give her the unique impression of tragic mystery amongst modern novelists.

Then again Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot wrote prose fictions which may by a stretch of language be called novels. But the wit of *Candide*, the passions of the *Religieuse*, the passion of *Héloïse* do not make up a tale fit to be placed beside *Silas Marner*, as a complete gem of art in the true field of romance. Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Goethe, Victor Hugo, Carlyle may take rank above George Eliot in

the sum of the intellectual impulse they gave to their time. But none of them, unless it be the author of the *Misérables*, can be said to be her equal in the painting of real life and actual manners.

And here we may find at once the strength and the weakness of George Eliot. With a mental equipment of the first order, her principal instrument was art. And so she played a double part—as the most philosophic artist, or the most artistic philosopher in recent literature. It has been well said that there are flashes of hers which recall Pascal, Dante, Tacitus. There are certainly some which are worthy of Burke, Condorcet, or Vauvenargues. There are single passages which Bacon might have conceived, and others which Montaigne might have written. And again there are thoughts which Coleridge and De Maistre have never surpassed. One need not compare her in the sum with any of these famous thinkers. It is plain that in philosophy she has not produced work that can weigh with theirs. But it is the sustained commerce with men like these, the continually recurring sense that we are in contact with a mind of their order, of the same intellectual family, which rouses in us so intense a delight in her novels that we are apt to indulge in hyperbolic language.

But the question comes in, and it must be answered, "Could she play the double part perfectly?" Did her philosophy, culture, moral earnestness, overweight her art? or was her art the complete and easy instrument for interpreting all that her brain and her soul contained? Few are now convinced that her art was always equal to so great a demand. For that reason it may be doubted whether it will ultimately take the very first rank. A few of the greatest sons of men have combined all that their age had attained with supreme creative ease. Milton, Shakespeare, Dante, and Virgil seem to use their vast intellectual power as if poetry were their mother-tongue, their natural organ of thought. Alone of the moderns, Goethe wields his panoply of learning with perfect ease, bounding in his full suit of mail on to his charger like some paladin, and careering in it over the field as if it were a robe of tissue. But it is given only to the one or two of the greatest to interpret the profoundest thought, to embody the ripest knowledge, in the inimitable mystery of art.

And thus it comes about that we so often feel the art of George Eliot to be short of perfect. The canvas of laborious culture is too often visible through the colouring of the picture. We find so much to think about that we crave a little rest for simple enjoyment. The chorus is very majestic; we are amazed by forked flashes of wisdom, sonorous gnomes, prophetic strains worthy of the immortal Trilogy; but the Chorus is often a little slow; and sometimes slightly senile, goody, prolix. We have come to a tragedy, we know; but we crave more business, incident, light and air. I confess that, for my part, I feel in the George Eliot cycle something of that which I am Goth

enough to experience when I hear Beethoven's *Fidelio*. *Fidelio* is undoubtedly one of the most glorious creations of modern music, with an almost matchless overture, a noble chorus, a high moral in its plot, and a finale which seems heroism transfigured into song. And yet—the entire scene passing in prison, the darkened stage, the slow movement, the monotony of minor key, to speak figuratively, the want of contrast, colour, buoyancy fill me with a certain involuntary sensation of gloom. I go home, purified, and thrilled by a noble work of art resounding with high moral purpose—but a little lowered in nervous vitality. Something of the kind I feel when I read *Romola*.

For my part, I would choose *Silas Marner* as the best type. It is the complete working out of one pathetic idea in a single melody. That sustained minor key could hardly be borne through a long piece in several volumes, and the idea is one which breadth, brilliancy, variety, and movement would impair. But in a miniature such as this it produces a profound impression. It may be classed along with the *Mère au Diable*, *François le Champi*, and *Eugénie Grandet*:—more pure, more thoughtful than any of these, but hardly to be named beside such an immortal idyl as the *Vicar of Wakefield*.

Let us who love the art of George Eliot abstain, if only in obedience to her teaching, from all extravagance of eulogy. Certain that she belongs to the foremost intellectual forces of our time, and seeing that she is a novelist (for neither poems nor essays express her genius truly), some are apt to decide that she stands in the very front rank of the artists of the modern world. That is surely to claim a great deal too much. Cervantes, Fielding, Scott, of course, stand immeasurably apart and above, by virtue of their wealth of imagination, their range of insight into manners, and sympathy with character of every type. Goldsmith, Defoe, Richardson, I think too Sterne and Lesage, stand again in another class by virtue of their consummate art in producing, in some more limited field, images of pathos, humour, naïveté, or vitality, worthy in their own sphere of the mightiest master's hand.

The place of George Eliot will doubtless ultimately be found in the group where we set George Sand, Balzac, Jane Austen, Dickens, Thackeray, the Brontës. Judging her purely as artist, we can hardly hope that her ultimate popularity will quite equal theirs. That she is immeasurably superior to them as thinker, teacher, inspirer of thought and purifier of soul will perhaps be little disputed. As facile creator of types, painter of varied character, voracious chronicler of manners, she has not their range, vivacity, irrepressible energy. In art very much must be given to mass of impression, vividness of enjoyment, fertility of creation. The inexhaustible charm of George Sand, the microscopic vivacity of Jane Austen, the pathetic oddities of Charles Dickens, the terrible Hogarthian pencil of Balzac and

Thackeray were all deliberately foregone by a novelist who read so deeply, who looked on life so profoundly, and who meditated so conscientiously as George Eliot.

These letters show us the conditions under which her genius worked, and enable us curiously to watch the limits which she so carefully set upon herself. Though she disdains to vent such wails and groans as *Friedrich* or the *Revolution* wring from the much-tried soul of Carlyle, George Eliot sets about a new tale with all the conscientious *gründlichkeit* which Sartor brought to his task. Just as he pounds over the battle-fields of his hero, and wades through the *Moniteur* or Puritan sermons, so she begins *Romola* or *Felix Holt* by getting up Florence and Chartism. There are scientific similes and moral reflections in *Middlemarch* which a man might well spend an hour in working out in all their connotations. And there is as much hard thinking and analytic psychology in any chapter of the *Mill on the Floss* or *Daniel Deronda* as would have driven little Jane Austen silly so much as to comprehend. But these are not precisely the conditions of perfect art. Scott did not get up the Crusades when he wrote *Ivanhoe* or read articles on "Cavaliers," "Covenant," and so forth when he wrote *Old Mortality*. Scott was bursting with all he knew about Malignants and Cropped heads; he was bursting with his story, and brimful of his characters. If you had stopped him in his ride he would have rattled on about it; and at supper with the young ones he would sing Bothwell's songs and repeat Burley's curses. Jane Austen would write little romancelets to her girl correspondents, and she photographed her partners in the midst of a ball. George Sand, amidst sonatas from Chopin and songs by Madame Viardot, would pour out her prose lyrics as the lark empties her soul; and Dickens or Thackeray cared more for a queer name or a whimsical expression than for all the psychology in Kant or Hegel.

But if this knowledge, philosophic power, and moral seriousness, are in one sense a weakness, closing to George Eliot the highest circle of art, in another sense they are her strength and the source of her real influence. English literature has only one weak side. It has abundant examples of almost every type of literary art. But it is curiously poor in those thoughts in which the literature of France and Greece abound; those *Pensées* wherein Descartes, Pascal, Vauvenargues, Voltaire, Diderot embodied philosophy in some memorable phrase which is worth a volume; or those golden words of wisdom—*κτῆμα εἰς αἰεὶ*—which Plato, Thucydides, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius made current coin for ever. Now the novels of George Eliot are rich with such apophthegms wherein ripe meditations on morals and men are embodied in words of poetic concentration and beauty.

These letters (and it is their chief interest) show us this cast of mind in its growth and activity. Almost every feature of the novels is abundantly traceable as part of her daily life and mental habit.

In her familiar letters, in her casual reading and least serious occupation, we find that dominant tone of moral analysis, the undertone of steadfast sobriety almost, but not quite, passing into melancholy, the strenuous trust in a better time to come, with the resolute facing of the darker problems of life. It is curious to note that the very style and phrase so familiar in the novels was part of her mental constitution. The good people who trace everything of well or ill in human character to the degree in which one accepts or rejects the miracles in the Old Testament, and who ascribe what they are pleased to call the sadness of George Eliot's novels to her want of adequate hold on verbal inspiration, will be surprised to find in these letters that the sadness is principally visible in her Calvinistic and Biblical period, that it almost disappears from her soul when theology had become to her a merely interesting experience. So, too, the love of scientific illustrations, what one might more truly call the analogies of physical and moral laws, seems to possess her more strongly as a girl, even than in after life when she lived amongst men of science. At the age of nineteen she perpetrated a simile wherein her mind is likened to "a stratum of conglomerated fragments," perhaps more complicated than any to be found in later writings (vol. i. p. 59). It is obvious too that her style grows simpler as she became a great writer. There is (vol. i. p. 76) a single sentence with upwards of two hundred words in it, and eighteen stops before we get to the pause. And a few lines farther on, there is a beautiful but most elaborate parallel between organic development in sociologic and in biologic types. "Sewing," she writes, "is my staple article of commerce with the hard trader Time." And all this by a girl of twenty, living in a quiet farm-house, in 1840, when Sociology and most of the other "ologies," had not been heard of! She reads a book on the battles of Condé and Turenne, and cries out, "Such a conflict between *individual* and *moral* influence is no novelty."

The Life enables us to answer the question, if George Eliot was a pessimist of confirmed melancholy type? Assuredly not. She was throughout life, very serious, constitutionally of low animal spirits, liable to nervous depression, and with a certain unconquerable shyness. But she is not melancholy—at least not after she had shaken off the cruel burden of Calvinism. Towards middle life and onwards to its end she is, as she happily said, a *meliorist*; facing the world with clear vision in all its evil, but confident in its progress towards the *better*. In all this we see the complete correspondence between her belief and her general temper. In girlhood a devout Evangelical Christian, in youth a somewhat sceptical Agnostic, in maturity she settles into a deep religious earnestness, where the evolution of man's destiny is the inspiration and the ideal. We see this grand conception of man's progress towards the better entirely possessing her soul. It colours her letters, words, and conduct. We see it giving her life

rest, fulness, cheerfulness, and purpose. It nerves her with self-control in sickness, disappointment, and weariness. It gives a moral glow to her intercourse with friends, to her consideration for all who come near her, to her plans for work and art. It makes her reticent, resigned, contented, full of merciful feeling, and slow to give offence or to take it. In all these letters there is not a spiteful word, not an outburst of egoism, nothing fretful, sordid, jealous, or malicious. It is the affectionate, self-possessed, humanising life of a high-souled woman; devoted to her art, but ever keeping room in her thoughts for the few whom she chose as her friends.

The letters prove, what no intelligent reader of her books could doubt, that George Eliot was womanly in the true sense of the term. She even took a curious pride in her skill in all the accomplishments of the housewife; and her experience, which ranged from the management of a dairy farm to that of a crowded drawing-room, was indeed unusually large. Her interest in the education of women was not only very keen, but very practical. She was naturally the centre of all those movements which aimed at the realisation of women's best future. Yet of the ordinary babble about women's rights we find not a word in these volumes, not a word even of disdain. It glanced off her unheeded. And it is noteworthy that a woman who in brain, in culture, in aspirations, in knowledge of the world o'er-topped all the women of her time, hardly paid the suffrage clamour the compliment of a rebuke.

The publication of these letters and the witness of her husband will confirm the unmistakeable impression produced by her books with respect to her religious and philosophical opinions. Obviously, as all the world could see, she formally accepted no church and no school as an absolute adherent. At the age of twenty-two she passed gently and gradually from orthodox piety into a vague deism, which in middle life, in the attacks on Young and Cumming, developed a negative side, and at last she adopted a conscious belief in the force of humanity and its future. It is most striking that in all this history of mental progress there is no perceptible break. One phase grows out of the other without storm or interruption; and throughout the same religious earnestness remains and deepens, even whilst the bases of belief are changed. There is here no story of conversion, no infidelity, no surrender of one religion or adoption of another. It is a true religious evolution: the profound religious feelings of her reverent spirit continuing always in unimpaired fulness, as her knowledge ripened and as her vision of truth grew clear. George Eliot nourished from childhood to the grave the same religious nature which had dawned in the church of Griff, when she read the *Pilgrim's Progress* as a girl, and talked of the soul's awakening with her aunt Dinah, and which was fuller and deeper at the last year of life, when with her husband she read Isaiah, St. Paul, and the *General View of Positivism*.

What, it will be asked, was her general attitude towards Positivism? It is stated with entire accuracy by Mr. Cross in his *Life* (vol. iii. p. 419): "For all Comte's writing she had a feeling of high admiration, intense interest, and very deep sympathy." Much of his system she wholly refused to accept. With the Positivist movement generally she was in active relation, and she even had contemplated a poetic embodiment of Positivist aspirations (vol. iii. p. 311). But there was no reason to suppose that she would ever have entered into formal communion with that or any other religious body or with any philosophical school. It is very different when we come to speak of her sympathies and general tendencies. With the cardinal ideas of Positivism—the cherishing and extension of all true religious sentiment, and the direction of that sentiment towards the collective well-being of mankind—not only was George Eliot in profound sympathy, but no one else in our time has expressed those ideas with such power. In that sense, vigorously rejecting, as she did much of Comte's system, and with a constitutional repugnance for systems and codes of life, she may be said to be the greatest believer in humanity as a religious inspiration whom our country and time have produced. Throughout her novels, in the *Spanish Gypsy*, in the poem on Immortality there glows the idea, that in the destinies of the human race the future will find the object alike of Reverence and of Duty.

Here one would be glad to end. But the publication of these letters has aroused discussion on a moral problem, whereon to keep silence is to be misunderstood. It is the duty of those who have cause to speak at all to make clear their canons of right and wrong; but it can never be a duty to pass public judgment on the lives of our departed friends. Now the present writer during many years was the friend of George Eliot, the friend of George Lewes. It is but a few years since he followed first one, and then the other, to the united graves where they lie side by side. He owed to them both very much in many ways. He is still the friend of those whom he and she left behind. He was a witness of the unbroken happiness of their joint life; of their affectionate performance of every domestic duty; of their scrupulous observance of all that they recognised as belonging to a pure and refined home; of his devoted love for her till death, of her honour of his memory whilst life remained.<sup>1</sup>

On the general law of moral duty our own position is clear. The cause to which some of us have pledged our lives (would that he and she had done so!) is labouring in every way to fortify the marriage bond; would teach the future to make it indissoluble by law, and indissoluble even by death. In the chaos which has followed the loosening of old moral and religious canons, strange and unwholesome

(1) A few months before her death she wrote (21 May, 1880): "I would still give up my own life willingly, if he could have the happiness instead of me" (vol. iii. p. 396).

doctrines are put forth in the name of society and moral duty; and whilst opinion and religion still sanction divorce, the unsettlement of ideas will still be profound. But, we trust, the future will recognise that responsibility in marriage and happiness in marriage alike depend on its irrevocable nature. The future will know nothing of degrees of marriage or of any honourable union but that of the inflexible law of the land. In this welter of opinion, we hesitate to judge the act of those who sacrifice their lives to what they hold to be honour and duty. But it is the essence of marriage to be above the field of individual exceptions, to stand supreme, high beyond all personal opinions, miseries, or joys. The happiness of individuals would be dearly bought if it dimmed, by one passing shadow of suspicion, the inviolable institution whereon the happiness of all depends. *Il est indigne des grands cœurs de répandre le trouble qu'ils ressentent.* It is meet sometimes that some suffer for the people. The moral law is infinitely more precious than the personal happiness of any; and the sufferings of exceptional cases must be borne with resignation, lest harm befall the sanctity of every home, and "the moral currency be debased."

In the "General View" of the "grotesque French pedant" aforesaid, by whose intellectual impulse the genius of George Eliot was saturated, there is a beautiful picture of the art which the future will open to women, an art of which George Eliot herself furnishes a most suggestive type. For women, he says, is reserved the foremost place in the poetry of private life, and by poetry, as usual, he means the whole field of creative art in letters. He doubts if they will equally succeed in the epic and dramatic poetry concerned with public life, or ever give to mankind an Iliad or a Lear. But for all poetic composition which does not involve this intense and prolonged effort (after all, imagination depends on mass of nerve power), women of genius, he thinks, are better qualified than men. To them belongs the poetry of the heart and the home. There is an exquisite saying of the philosopher, one of those immortal words where wit, truth, and pathos are blended in a phrase: "If the Kingdom of Heaven belong to the poor in spirit, the Kingdom of Earth will belong to the rich in heart." And to women is given the crown of that poetry which seeks to idealise domestic life and the mystery of feeling. Miss Edgeworth, Jane Austen, the Brontës, George Sand, Eugénie de Guérin, to say nothing of a crowd of minor lights, have given us visions into character and feeling which are each in their way of unrivalled beauty. And now George Eliot, the latest of this choir of women-poets, has given us high promise of even greater yet to come.

For, even if we doubt whether George Eliot could always bend the bow of Ulysses with the perfect ease of the demi-gods, as Goethe, Milton, and Dante, to whom profound thought and knowledge add a fresh grace, even if her very moral and intellectual depth diminish



the spontaneous charm of her work, there is in that very depth a promise of the type of the art to be, even higher than any we have reached. Fiction, with the intricacy of its moral problems, the subtlety of its spiritual analysis, is the special creation of modern literature. It is the art in which, with music, our age has utterly surpassed the ages before, and wherein we may yet look forward to unbounded triumphs to come. Yet fiction is still in its infancy, in its tentative, unconscious, uninspired stage. All great art, from the beginning of the world, has been the child of corresponding religion, philosophy, and manners. Greek drama, Roman epic, mediæval poetry, architecture, and painting: Æschylus, Phidias, Virgil, Dante, Giotto, Shakespeare, Calderon, Raffaele, Milton, were but interpreters of a civilisation which rested ultimately on profound religious and social ideas.

The romance has grown up as the special art of the modern world; but where are its religious and social ideals? Its religious and social ideals are various and unstable as the opinions of modern men. Romance in some sort is the expression of those various opinions, the casting hither and thither of many minds and moods in many changing situations. To this romance owes much of its vivacity, its inexhaustible variety, its fascinating interest for men and women who think and feel. It teaches us mysteries of the heart that were hidden from the gaze of Aristotle and Bacon, from Pascal and Kant. It has myriads of subtle problems of life which escaped the vision of Shakespeare and Molière. Yet does any one doubt that romance, too, like other arts, will be greatest when it has its religious and social ideals? Such ideals it will have when they are finally revealed to the fuller conscience of some nobler age. What a vision of the romancer's art is unfolded to us if we believe in a religious future, where the human heart itself shall furnish the religious ideal, and the march of civilisation be the source of creed, the fountain of all reverence! How glorious, even above his actual glory, would our English Homer, Walter Scott, have been, if behind his pictures of human history he had seen his religious ideals transfigured as clearly as Homer saw them! What would Fielding have been, had his moral and religious development equalled his human sympathy? What would George Sand have given us had her passion known purity, as the passion of Shakespeare, Dante, and Calderon ever does? Scott, Fielding, Sand gave us glorious things: but greater are to come when romance has grown to be the artistic form of religion and philosophy. George Eliot, by no means the first amongst the founders of modern romance, yet stands apart from all by a deeper quality of her own. And, by virtue of her spiritual conception of her art, she points the way to a type far greater than she reached herself, even greater than any which has gone before.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

## • ORGANIC NATURE'S RIDDLE.

AMONGST the many sagacious sayings of the patient and profound thinkers of Germany, not the least noteworthy was Schelling's affirmation that the phenomena of instinct are some of the most important of all phenomena, and capable of serving as a very touch-stone whereby the value of competing theories of the universe may be effectually tested. His prescience has been justified by our experience. The greatest scientific event of the present time is the wide acceptance of the theory of evolution, and its use as a weapon of offence and defence. It is used both against the belief that intelligent purpose is, as it were, incarnate in the living world about us, and also in favour of a merely mechanical theory of nature. Now it would be difficult to find a more searching test of that theory's truth than is supplied by a careful study of instinct. The essence of that view of nature which is associated with the name of Professor Haeckel<sup>1</sup>, a negation of the doctrine of final causes and an assertion of what he calls "Dysteleology," that is, the doctrine of the purposelessness of the organs and organisms which people a purposeless planet. That doctrine may be called the gospel of the irrationality of the universe, and it is a doctrine to which a proof of the real existence of such a thing as "instinct" must necessarily be fatal. Instinct has been defined<sup>2</sup> as a "special internal impulse, urging animals to the performance of certain actions which are useful to them or to their kind, but the use of which they do not themselves perceive, and their performance of which is a necessary consequence of their being placed in certain circumstances." Such an impulse is always understood to be the result of sensations; actions which take place in response to *unfelt* stimuli being referred, not to instinct, but to what is termed *reflex action*. In such action it is commonly supposed that the mechanism of a living body occasions a prompt responsive muscular movement upon the occurrence of some unfelt stimulation of the nervous system. The nervous system, or total mass of nerve-stuff—which is technically called "nerve-tissue"—in the body of an animal, such as a beast, bird, reptile, or fish, is composed of two parts or divisions. One of these divisions consist of a voluminous and continuous mass—the brain and spinal cord (or spinal marrow), which

(1) It is often associated unfairly with the illustrious name of the late Mr. Darwin. His special views lend themselves indeed to Haeckelianism, and have been pressed into its service; yet they are by no means to be identified therewith. As Professor Huxley has pointed out with his usual lucidity and force, Darwin's theory can be made to accord with the most thorough-going teleology.

(2) See Todd's *Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology*, vol. iii. p. 3.

form what is called the central part of the nervous system. The second division consists of a multitude of white threads or cords—the nerves, which form what is called the peripheral part of the nervous system. Of these nerves one set proceed forth from the central part of the nervous system to the different muscles, which they can cause to contract by a peculiar action they exert upon them, thus producing motion. Another set of nerves proceed inwards, from the skin to the central part of the nervous system, and by their peculiar action give rise to various sensations, according as different influences or stimulations are brought to bear upon the skin at, or in the vicinity of, their peripheral extremities. Under ordinary circumstances, different stimulations of the surface of the body convey an influence inwards, which produces sensation, and gives rise to an outwardly proceeding influence to the muscles, resulting in definite and appropriate motions.

There are cases in which responsive actions take place under very abnormal conditions—as after a rupture of part of a man's spinal cord, or the removal of the whole brain in lower animals, such as the frog. A man so injured may have utterly lost the power of feeling any stimulation—pricking, cutting, or burning—of his legs and feet, the injury preventing the conveyance upwards to the brain of the influence necessary to ordinary sensation, and stopping short at the spinal cord below the point of injury. Nevertheless, such a man may execute movements in response to stimuli just as if he did feel, and often in an exaggerated manner. He will withdraw his foot if tickled with a feather just as if he felt the tickling, which he is utterly incapable of feeling. Similarly a decapitated frog will make with his hind legs the most appropriate movements to remove any irritating object applied to the hinder part of its body. Such action is termed “reflex action,” on the supposition that the influence conveyed inwards by nerves going from the skin to the spinal cord is reflected back from that cord to the muscles by the other set of nerves without any intervention of sensation. This action of the frog may be carried to a very singular extreme. At the breeding season the male frog tightly grasps the female behind her arms, and to enable him the more securely to maintain his hold, a warty prominence is then developed on the inner side of each of his hands. Now if such a male frog be taken, and not only decapitated, but the whole hinder part of the body removed also, so that nothing remains but the fragment of the trunk from which the two arms with their nerves proceed, and if under these circumstances the warty prominences be touched, the two arms will immediately close together like a spring, thus affording a most perfect example of reflex action. It has been objected by the late Mr. G. H. Lewes and others that we cannot be sure but that the spinal cord itself “feels.” But there is often an ambiguity in the use of the term “to feel.” By it we ordinarily

mean a "modification of consciousness;" but experiences\* such as those just adverted to, and others in ourselves to which I shall next advert, show clearly that surrounding agents may act upon our sense organs without the intervention of anything like consciousness, and yet produce effects otherwise similar to those which occur when they do arouse consciousness. Without, then, entering into any discussion as to whether "sentiency" may or may not be attributed to the spinal cord, it seems evident that some definite term is required to denote such affections or modifications of living beings as those just referred to. Inasmuch as they are affections of creatures possessing a nervous system, which is the essential organ of sensation, and as they resemble sensation in their causes and effects though feeling itself may be absent, they may be provisionally distinguished as "unfelt sensations." Such are some of the actions with which instinct is contrasted, because, unlike instinct, they are not carried on by the aid of felt sensations, the highest of such insentient action being reflex action.

There are also a number of actions which constantly recur in ourselves, which more or less nearly approximate to reflex action. Thus the respiratory movements, the various muscular motions by the aid of which we breathe, are ordinarily performed by us without advertence, though we can, if we will, perform them with self-conscious deliberation. It is well also to note that when our mind is entirely directed upon some external object, or when we are almost in a state of somnolent unconsciousness, we have but a vague feeling of our existence—a feeling resulting from the unobserved synthesis of our sensations of all orders and degrees. This unintellectual sense of "self" may be conveniently distinguished from intellectual consciousness as "consentience." We may also, as everybody knows, suddenly recollect sights or sounds which were quite unnoticed at the time we experienced them; yet our very recollection of them proves that they must, nevertheless, have affected our sensorium. Such unnoticed modifications of our sense organs may also be provisionally included in the category of those actions of the lower animals, before provisionally denominated "unfelt sensations." It is not, however, with such inferior activities as reflex and other insentient actions that instinct is commonly contrasted, but with "reason." Now "reasonable," "consciously intelligent" conduct is understood by all men to mean conduct in which there is a more or less wise adaptation of means to ends—a conscious, deliberate adaptation, not one due to accident only. No one would call an act done blindly a reasonable or intelligent action on the part of him who did it, however fortunate might be its result. Instinctive actions, then, hold a middle place between (1) those which are rational, or truly intelligent, and (2) those in which sensation has no place. But a great variety of actions of different kinds occupy this intermediate

position,\* and we must next proceed to separate off from the others, such actions as may be deemed *truly* instinctive.

M. Albert Lemoine, who has written the best treatise known to us on instinct and habit, distinguishes instinctive actions as those which are neither due to mechanical or chemical causes, nor to intelligence, experience, or will. They are actions which take place with a general fixity and precision, are generally present in all the individuals of each species, and can be perfectly performed the very first time their action is called for, so that they cannot be due to habit. Instinct, he very truly says, is more than a want and less than a desire. Instinct is a certain felt internal stimulus to definite actions which has its foundation in a certain sense of want, but is not a definite feeling of want of the particular end to be attained. Were that recognised, it would not be *instinct*, but *desire*. It is but a vague craving to exercise certain activities the exercise of which conduces to useful or needful, but unforeseen, end. Instinct often sets in motion organs quite different from those which feel the prick of want, and which do not (experience apart) seem to have relation with it. Hunger does not stimulate to action the organs of digestion which suffer from it, but excites the limbs and jaws to perform acts by which food may be obtained and eaten. In examining into instinct, we must be careful not to omit the consideration of it as it exists in man, since we can know no creature so well as we can, by the help of language and reflection, know ourselves and our own species. Nevertheless, it may be well to begin by calling attention to certain apparently undeniable cases of instinct in other animals, since in them instinct is much more apparent and complex than in man, in whom it is indeed reduced to a minimum. It might naturally be expected to be so reduced in him—if it is a power serving to bridge over the gulf which exists between such almost mechanical action as reflex action, and true intelligence—since in man acts of intelligence, or habits originated through intelligence, come so constantly into play. But before enumerating cases of animal instinct, a word should be said as to one character which M. Lemoine attributes to instinctive action, namely, “consciousness.” This term is an exceedingly ambiguous one, as it is often referred, not only to our distinct intellectual perception of our own being and acts, but also to every state of feeling however rudimentary it may be. I would therefore avoid the use of so equivocal a term, while fully admitting that no sensation in any animal is possible without some subjective psychical state analogous to what I have before denominated “consentience.” Now, as to the lower animals: birds unquestionably possess instinctive powers. Chickens, two minutes after they have left the egg,<sup>2</sup> will follow with their eyes the movements of crawling insects,

(1) *L'Habitude et l'Instinct*. Baillière. Paris. 1876.

(2) As Mr. Spalding has shown. To him I am indebted for the other facts about young birds given in the text.

and peck at them, judging distance and direction with almost infallible accuracy. They will instinctively appreciate sounds, readily running towards an invisible hen hidden in a box, when they hear her "call." Some young birds, also, have an innate, instinctive horror of the sight of a hawk and of the sound of its voice. Swallows, titmice, tomtits, and wrens, after having been confined from birth, are capable of flying successfully at once, when liberated, on their wings having attained the necessary growth to render flight possible. The Duke of Argyll<sup>1</sup> relates some very interesting particulars about the instincts of birds, especially of the water ousel, the merganser, and the wild duck. Even as to the class of beasts I find recorded:<sup>2</sup> "Five young polecats were found comfortably embedded in dry withered grass; and in a side hole, of proper dimensions for such a larder, were forty frogs and two toads, all alive, but merely capable of sprawling a little. On examination the whole number, toads and all, proved to have been purposely and dexterously bitten through the brain." Evidently the parent polecat had thus provided the young with food which could be kept perfectly fresh, because alive, and yet was rendered quite unable to escape. This singular instinct is like others which are yet more fully developed amongst insects—a class of animals the instincts of which are so numerous, wonderful, and notorious that it will be, probably, enough to refer to one or two examples. The female carpenter bee, in order to protect her eggs, excavates, in some piece of wood, a series of chambers, in special order with a view to a peculiar mode of exit for her young: but the young mother can have no conscious knowledge of the series of actions subsequently to ensue. The female of the wasp, *sphex*, affords another well-known but very remarkable example of a complex instinct closely related to that already mentioned in the case of the polecat. The female wasp has to provide fresh, living animal food for her progeny, which, when it quits its egg, quits it in the form of an almost helpless grub, utterly unable to catch, retain, or kill an active, struggling prey. Accordingly the mother insect has not only to provide and place beside her eggs suitable living prey, but so to treat it that it may be a helpless, unresisting victim. That victim may be a mere caterpillar, or it may be a great, powerful grasshopper, or even that most fierce, active, and rapacious of insect tyrants, a fell and venomous spider. Whichever it may be, the wasp adroitly stings it at the spot which induces, or in the several spots which induce, complete paralysis as to motion, let us hope as to sensation also. This done, the wasp entombs the helpless being with its own egg, and leaves it for the support of the future grub. Another species feeds her young one from time to time with fresh food, visiting at suitable intervals the nest she has

(1) *The Unity of Nature*, chap. iii.

(2) See *Magazine of Natural History*, vol. vi. p. 206. \*

made and carefully covered and concealed with earth, which she removes and replaces, as far as necessary, at each visit. If the opening be made ready for her, this, instead of helping her to get at her young, altogether puzzles her, and she no longer seems to recognise her young, thus showing how thoroughly "instinctive" her proceedings are. Other instances of instinct, such as those of the stag-beetle and emperor moth, I will refer to presently. But most wonderful, perhaps, of all are the instincts of social insects, such as bees, where there are not only males and females, but a large population of practically neuter insects, the special instincts and peculiarities of which have of course to be transmitted, not directly by an antecedent set of neuter animals, but by females, the instincts and peculiarities of which are very different from those of the neutral portion of their progeny.

The instincts we have hitherto noticed, and, I may say briefly, the instincts of animals generally, are destined to subserve two functions, (1) the preservation and, mainly, the nutrition, of the individual, and (2) the reproduction of the species. Armed with the facts we have now noticed, let us turn to consider instinct as it displays itself in ourselves. As one example, there is the instinctive action by which an infant first sucks the nipple, and then swallows the thence-extracted nourishment with which its mouth is filled. This action must be reckoned as instinctive, because it is done directly after birth, when there has been no time for learning to perform the action; it is one absolutely necessary for the life of the infant; it is an action which is definite and precise, similarly performed by all the individuals of the species, though effected by a very complex mechanism, and is effected prior to experience. Yet it is not as mechanical as reflex action, for not only sensation, but consentience, accompanies the act. Thus sucking in man is an instinctive action, while spitting, on the other hand, is an art. The latter is not necessary to life, and the power of performing it is slowly acquired by experience, as are also our powers of walking and feeding ourselves. But the action of sucking in an adult human being is of course not instinctive; and because the child learns to walk, it by no means follows that the insect learns to fly. It is thus plain that actions may be instinctive in one animal and not in another; or at one period of life in the same animal and not at another. In a child, however, sucking, deglutition, inspiration, and expiration are instinctive actions, as are also those by which the products of excretion are removed from the body. The second class of instincts, those which ensure the continuance of the race, show themselves of course, only much later. Yet, long before the little girl can represent to herself future tributes to her charms, she seeks to decorate her tiny body with the arts of infant coquetry. Still less does she look forward to the pains and pleasures of mater-

nity when she begins to caress and chastise, to soothe and cherish, her first doll, and fondly presses it to that region whence her future offspring will draw its nourishment. Again, when the lapse of a few years having made her a young woman and the boy a youth, they first feel the influence of love, however ignorant they may be of the physiology of their race, they will none the less, circumstances permitting, be surely impelled towards the performance of very definite actions. In the more refined individuals of the highest races of mankind, the material, merely animal, consummation of sexual love is most certainly far from being the one great end distinctly looked forward to by each pair of lovers. Yet every incident of affectionate intercourse, every tender glance, every contact of hand or lip, infallibly leads on towards the one useful end, indispensable to the race, which nature has in view. Such actions fully merit to be called "instinctive." Indeed the act of generation is ministered to in nature by the most manifold, imperious, general, and inexplicable of all the instincts, and its instinctive character is the most strongly marked of all. It has emphatically for its origin a rigorously determined and precise want, partly painful, partly pleasurable—a mixture of a feeling of privation with a sense of power. Its end is unknown to the agent, or if known is disregarded, and in almost all animals it demands the concurrent and reciprocal action of two diverse organisms. If anyone would deny that it is instinctive in man, I would advise him to study the sad phenomena connected therewith which may be observed in our asylums for the insane.

There are other human actions which are sometimes reckoned as instinctive, such as guarding the eye against injury by suddenly closing the eyelids. This action, however, appears to be an acquired art, though the habitual act of winking to keep clean the surface of the eye may be instinctive. Some other actions, however, not generally regarded as instinctive, I should be disposed so to regard. Such are the first *active* exercises of the senses of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling (the first "looking," the first "listening," &c.) which the child performs at the very beginning of its learning to perform them. It would seem, then, as if no one could deny the existence of such a thing as instinct, and yet it has been denied, not only in recent times, but centuries ago. Thus Montaigne sought to explain instinct as but a form of intelligence, while Descartes taught that it was but mechanism. Condillac regarded it as the result of individual experience, and Lemarck considered it to be merely "habit" which had become hereditary. In our own day Darwin has sought to explain it as partly the result of accidental variations of activity, which variations have become naturally selected, and partly the result of intelligent, purposive action which has become habitual and inherited. Let us consider these attempts at explanation seriatim. First as to mechanism: This is an hypothesis no one at present entertains, as



everyone now credits animals with sensitivity. Moreover, instincts are not absolutely invariable, but are modifiable according to the degree of "intelligence" which animals possess. They cannot, therefore, be due merely to a mechanism. The attempt to explain "Instinct" by mere "reflex action" is equivalent to an attempt to explain a phenomenon by omitting its most striking characteristic. In "reflex action" we have a sudden response to a stimulus, which response is more or less purposive as regards the time of its occurrence, but has no reference to future events to occur long after the faintest waves of the stimulating action have died out. The very essence of "instinct," however, is to provide for a more or less distant future, often, as we have seen, the future of another generation. It is essentially *telic*, and directed to a future unforeseen, but generally useful, end. This explanation, then, is fundamentally and necessarily inadequate. It is like an explanation of the building of a house, by "bricks, mortar, bricklayers, and hodmen," with the omission of all reference to any influence governing their motions and directing them towards a common and predetermined end which is not theirs. But though we cannot explain "instinct," by "reflex action," there is none the less a certain obvious affinity between these two forms of animal activity, and it is in part my object to point out the nature of this very affinity.

Next we may pass in review the two hypotheses that instinct is but (1) a form of intelligence, or (2) individual experience. As to the first, I have already given instances of unquestionably instinctive actions performed by birds as soon as they quit the eggshell, and it would be but waste of time to argue against the view that the human infant is guided by intelligent purpose and conscious foresight in his very first acts of sucking, swallowing, and defecation. Actual intelligence, therefore, is a radically insufficient explanation, as also, for the very same reasons, is Condillac's hypothesis as to individual experience. About "lapsed intelligence" I will speak later on. Lemarc's hypothesis, that instinct is but inherited habit, is one which is much more worthy of careful consideration than any we have yet considered. For it may be admitted at once that habits may be inherited. There are many instances of such inheritance in human beings, and as regards the lower animals, the barking of dogs may be taken as an instance of a habit thus perpetuated. In fact "habit," when inherited, so simulates instinct, that their confusion is far from surprising. There is, however, this radical difference between them: "habit" enables an agent to repeat with facility and precision an act which has been done before, but "instinct" determines with precision the first performance of such act. Referring instinct to habit, but temporarily relieves the difficulty of those who object to instinct, by putting it a step back. It is impossible to believe that any of the progenitors of an infant of to-day first acquired, during his or her

lifetime, the habit of sucking, or that the habits of neuter insects thus arose. But after all, if we *could* explain "instinct" by "habit," should we thereby make the phenomena less mysterious? "Habit" is due to an internal spontaneity of living things. A living thing no doubt requires some internal solicitation, in order that it should move, but when it does move that movement is *its own*. All living organisms tend to act. With them action is not only their nature, 'tis a want; and, within limits, their powers and energies increase with action, and diminish and finally perish through repose. The power of generating any "habit," lies in the very first act of the kind an organism performs, and it is only the first act which owes nothing to habit. If such were not the case, an act might be performed a thousand times and yet not generate habit. It is this mysterious internal active tendency which distinguishes all living organisms from inorganic bodies. The latter tend simply to persist as they are, and have no relations with the past or the future. They have, therefore, no relations with time at all—for the actual present ever evades us. Organisms, on the other hand, which are permanently more or less changed, through habit, by every new motion and sensation, have their future prepared by their past, and thus, as it were, at every present moment they live both in the past and in the future, a mode of existence which attains its fullest development in the highest living organism—man, the creature looking before and after! Thus those who would do away with mystery in nature would gain little by explaining instinct through habit, though, as we have seen, the phenomena presented to us by the human infant and by neuter insects absolutely bar any such explanation. Moreover, the attempt to explain "instinct" through "inheritance" is a contradiction, since "inheritance" supposes something already obtained, otherwise it could not be transmitted. So far, then, from "hereditary transmission" explaining "instinct," instinct, in whatever remote ancestor it first arose, must have been a violation of the law of hereditary transmission.

Now as to "lapsed intelligence:" This hypothesis assumes that a conscious, deliberate, discriminating faculty must have once been exercised by wasps, bees, ants, and other much more lowly animals, in the performance of all those actions which are now instinctive. But could the adult female insect be supposed to foresee the future needs of her first progeny, often so totally different from her own wants? It would surely be too much to ask us to believe that she could distinctly recollect all her past experience as a chrysalis and as a grub from the moment she first quitted the egg. Can we suppose that the generative acts of male insects, such as bees, could have been due to deliberate and rational choice, when every such act is necessarily fatal to him who performs it?

Nevertheless, persuaded as I am that "lapsed intelligence" will not explain "instinct" generally, I should be the last to deny that

certain apparently instinctive actions may be so explained, and I fully admit that intelligent action in ourselves does tend to become practically though not really instinctive. It is, moreover, very fortunate for us that such is the case, as thereby we are saved great mental friction. Our intellect has first to be laboriously applied to learn what afterwards becomes almost automatic, as the actions of reading, writing, &c. Sensations and bodily actions having been duly kneaded together, the intellect becomes free to withdraw and apply itself to other work—fresh conquests of mere animality—leaving the organism to carry on automatically the new faculties thus acquired. Were it not for this power which we have of withdrawing our attention, our intellect would be absorbed and wasted in the merest routine work, instead of being set free to appropriate and render practically instinctive, a continually wider and more important range of deliberate purposive actions. We come now to the sixth and last attempt to explain instinct, namely, Mr. Darwin's attempt. He has recognised the futility of seeking to explain many instinctive actions in any of the modes we have yet considered, and he has proposed, as before said, to explain such residual instinctive phenomena by the play of natural selection, *i.e.* of the destructive forces of nature upon small, accidental abnormalities of action on the part of individuals of a species; such abnormalities, when favourable to the existence of the individual, being preserved and perpetuated by the destruction of the other individuals of the same species who adhered to their ancestral tendencies. But this proposed explanation is not an explanation of the *origin* of instincts, but only of the changes and transformations of instincts already acquired. But putting back the date or modifying the form of the original instinct, in no way alters the essential nature of instinct or diminishes its mystery. Let us look at one or two strong cases of instinct, and see if it is credible that they should be due to mere accidental, haphazard, minute changes in habits already acquired. In the first place, there is the wonderful instinct of the duck, which feigns to have an injured wing, in order to entice a dog away from the pursuit of her ducklings. Is it conceivable that such an act was first done by pure accident, and that the descendants of her who so acted, having inherited the tendency, have been alone selected and preserved? Again, there is the case of the wasp, *sphex*, which stings spiders, caterpillars, and grasshoppers exactly in the spot, or spots, where their nervous ganglia lie, and so paralyses them. Even the strongest advocate of the intelligence of insects would not affirm that the mother *sphex* has a knowledge of the comparative anatomy of the nervous system of these very diversely formed insects. According to the doctrine of natural selection, either an ancestral wasp must have accidentally stung them each in the right places, and so our *sphex* of to-day is the naturally selected descendant of a line of insects which inherited this lucky tendency to sting different insects differ-

ently, but always in the exact situation of their nervous ganglia; or else the young of the ancestral sphex originally fed on dead food, but the offspring of some individuals who happened to sting their prey so as to paralyse but not kill them, were better nourished and so the habit grew. But the incredible supposition that the ancestor should accidentally have acquired the habit of stinging different insects differently, but always in the right spot, is not eliminated by the latter hypothesis.

There is, again, the case of neuter insects and the highly complex instincts of insects living in communities, such as bees, ants, and termites. The Darwinian theory has the great advantage of only needing for its support the suggestion of some possible utility in each case; and as all structures and functions in nature have their utility, the task is not a difficult one for an ingenious, patient, and accomplished thinker. Yet Mr. Darwin, with all his ingenuity, patience, and accomplishments, has been unable to suggest a rational explanation for the accidental origin of these insect communities with their marvellously complex instincts. I will confine myself to one more instance of a highly noteworthy instinct, which no one has in any way succeeded in explaining. The instance I refer to is that by which an animal, when an enemy approaches, lies quite quiescent and apparently helpless, an action often spoken of as "shamming death." To evade the force of this remarkable case of instinct, it has been objected that the disposition of the limbs adopted by insects which thus act, is not the same as that which the limbs assume when such insects are really dead, and that all species are not when thus acting equally quiescent. The first observation, however, does not concern the matter really at issue. The remarkable thing is not that a helpless insect should assume the position of its own dead, but that such a creature, instead of trying to escape, should adopt a mode of procedure utterly hopeless unless the enemy's attention is thereby effectually eluded. It is impossible that this instinct could have been gradually gained by the elimination of all those individuals who did not practise it, for if the quiescence, whether absolutely complete or not, were not sufficient at once to make the creature elude observation, its destruction would be only the more fully insured by such ineffectual quiescence. The same argument applies to birds which seem to feign lameness or other injury. Yet even if we could account for these cases, which as a fact are as yet entirely unaccounted for, it would not do away with the need of recognising the real existence and peculiar nature of instinct. It would not do so on account both of man's highest and of man's lowest instinctive powers. To speak first of the former: as instinct, such as we have hitherto discovered, is the appointed bridge between mere organic and intellectual animal life, so there is in man a further development of instinct, peculiar to him, and serving to bridge over the gulf between mere intelligent animal faculty and distinctly human reflective intellectual activity. Such

*special intellectual instinct is that which impels man to the external manifestation by voice or gesture of the mental abstractions which his intellect spontaneously forms, and which are not formed by the lower animals, which give no evidence of this power of abstraction.* Language could never have been deliberately invented nor have arisen by a mere accidental individual variation, for vocal and gesture signs are essentially conventional, and require more or less comprehension on the part of those to whom they are addressed as well as on the part of those who use them. Analogous considerations apply to the first beginnings of what cannot be reckoned as merely instinctive activities, but the origins of which must have been akin to instincts. I refer to the beginnings of literature, art, science and politics, which were never deliberately invented. Even men who supposed they were inventing and constructing a certain new order of things with full purpose and much intelligence, have really been all the time so dominated by influences beyond their consciousness, that they really evolved something very different from what they supposed or intended. This fact has been most instructively shown by De Tocqueville and Taine with respect to the men who promoted and carried through the great French Revolution. So much, then, for man's highest instinctive powers: but our argument has no need to refer to them, for a consideration of man's lowest instinctive powers alone suffices to show that they cannot be due to "natural selection," even when aided by "lapsed intelligence." Can it be for a moment seriously maintained that such actions of the infant as those of the sucking, deglutition, and defecation, or the sexual instincts of later life, ever arose through the accidental conservation of haphazard variations of habit in ancestral animals? If it cannot be maintained, as I am confident it cannot, then it is absolutely impossible successfully to evade the difficulty of the existence of instinct. However far we may put back the beginnings of instinct, the question as to its origin (with its subsequent modifications) ever returns, and indeed with increased importunity. How did the first sentient creatures obtain and swallow their food? How did they first come to fecundate their ova or suitably to deposit them? How did they first effect such movements as might be necessary for their respiratory processes? Wherever such phenomena first manifested themselves in sentient organisms, we are compelled therein to recognise the manifest presence of instinct—the appointed means (as before said) of bridging over the interval between the purely vegetative functions and the intelligent activities of sentient animal life. "Natural selection" is manifestly impotent to account for the existence of such a faculty as that of "instinct." We have already seen that the hypothesis of "lapsed intelligence" is also impotent to account for it. Thus the most recently attempted explanation falls altogether to the ground. Nevertheless the theory of evolution renders it necessary to assume that as new species of animals

were from time to time evolved, so also were new and appropriate instincts. How then are we to account for the origin of such new instincts? That a certain mystery attends such origin cannot be denied, but a parallel mystery attends all other kinds of vital phenomena. What can be more mysterious than the purely organic functions of animals? Though not truly instinctive, they are full of unconscious purpose, and so are akin to instinct. Our nutrition is a process of self-generation by which the various bodies which constitute our food become transformed into our own substance. This process is effected by what is called assimilation, by which process the ultimate substance, or parenchyma, of our own body and of the bodies transforms part of what is immediately external to it, into the parenchyma itself. Again, the process of secretion is, as it were, parallel to the process of alimentation or nutrition. In secretion, the body extracts from the blood new substances (the secretions) which do not exist *as such* within it. In nutrition, the body extracts from the blood new substances (the various tissues) which do not exist *as such* within it. The blood is not the only source of our nutrition, since it has the power of replenishing itself. Thus the living particles which form the ultimate substance of our body exercise a certain power of choice with respect to the contents of the fluids which come in contact with them. Such particles are not passive bodies; they are active living agents, and their action no one has yet really explained. Here, then, are a set of activities which, if duly pondered over, will be found to be fully as mysterious and inexplicable in their unconscious teleology as any phenomena of instinct as ordinarily understood. But there is another class of organic vital actions which also seem to have a decided affinity both to reflex action and to instinct, though they are not to be regarded as actual instances of either of these faculties. The actions I refer to are those which bring about the repair of injuries and the reproduction of lost parts. They are like reflex action inasmuch as they take place in perfect unconsciousness and without the will having any power over them. They are like instinct inasmuch as they are directed towards a useful and unforeseen end. In the process of healing and repair of a wounded part of the body, a fluid, perfectly structureless substance, is secreted, or poured forth, from the parts about the wound. In this substance, cells arise and become abundant; so that the substance, at first structureless, becomes what is called cellular tissue. Then, by degrees, this structure transforms itself into vessels, tendons, nerves, bone, and membrane—into some or all of such parts—according to the circumstances of the case. In a case of broken bone, the two broken ends of the bone soften, the sharp edges thus disappearing. Then a soft substance is secreted, and this becomes at first gelatinous, often afterwards cartilaginous, and, finally, osseous or bony. But not only do these different kinds of substance—these distinct tissues—thus arise and develop them-

selves in this neutral or, as it is called, "undifferentiated" substance, but very complex structures, appropriately formed and nicely adjusted for the performance of complex functions, by which also be developed. We see this in the production of admirable formed joints in parts which were at first devoid of anything of the kind. I may quote, as an example, the case of a railway guard, whose arm had been so injured that he had been compelled to have the elbow with its joint cut out, but who afterwards developed a new joint almost as good as the old one. In the uninjured condition the outer bone of the lower arm—the radius—ends above in a smooth-surfaced cup, which plays against part of the lower end of the bone of the upper arm, or humerus, while its side also plays against the side of the other bone of the lower arm, the ulna, with the interposition of a cartilaginous surface. The radius and ulna are united to the humerus by dense and strong membranes or ligaments, which pass between it and them, anteriorly, posteriorly, and on each side, and are attached to projecting processes, one on each side of the humerus. Such was the condition of the parts which were removed by the surgeon. Nine years after the operation the patient died, and Mr. Syme had the opportunity of dissecting the arm, which in the meantime had served the poor man perfectly well, he having been in the habit of swinging himself by it from one carriage to another, while the train was in motion, quite as easily and securely as with the other arm. On examination, Mr. Syme found that the amputated end of the radius had formed a fresh polished surface, and played both on the humerus and the ulna, a material something like cartilage being interposed. The ends of the bones of the forearm were locked in by two processes projecting downwards from the humerus, and also strong lateral and still stronger anterior and posterior ligaments again bound them fast to the last-named bone.<sup>1</sup> It would be easy to bring forward a number of more or less similar cases. The amount of reproduction of lost parts which may take place in many of the lower animals is astonishing. Thus the tails of lizards, if broken off, will grow again, and the limbs of newts will be reproduced, with their bones, muscles, blood-vessels, and nerves. Even the eye and the lower jaw have been seen to be reproduced in the last-named animals. If certain worms be cut in two, each half will become a perfect animal, the head producing a new tail, and the tail a new head; and a worm called a *nais* has been cut into as many as twenty-five parts with a like result. But the most remarkable animal for its power of repairing injuries is the fresh-water hydra, almost any fragment of which will, under favourable circumstances, grow into a new and entire fresh animal. It is also a notorious and very noteworthy fact that, in both man and the lower animals, the processes of repair take place the more

(1) See Mr. Timothy Holmes's *System of Surgery*, 3rd edit. vol. iii. p. 746.

readily the younger the age of the injured individual may be. But these unconscious but practically teleological processes of repair, are often preceded by actions which everyone would call instinctive.

There is yet another class of organic vital actions to which I must advert, which are at once utterly unconscious, while the fact that they are directed to a distinct end is indisputable; in fact they are purposive in the very highest degree that any unconscious actions can be purposive. They are the actions of true reproduction, and they come before us naturally here, since a consideration of the process of remedial reproduction in the individual, naturally leads us on to the consideration of *the reproduction of the species itself*. In the cases of the frog and the butterfly, everyone knows that the creature which comes forth from the egg is very different from the parent. Animals, in fact, mostly attain their adult condition by passing through a series of developmental changes; only as a rule that series is not abruptly interrupted by plainly marked pauses, as it is in the frog and butterfly, and, therefore, such changes, instead of being obvious, are only to be detected with difficulty and through patient research. Almost every animal thus goes through a series of very remarkable changes during its individual process of development or, as it is called, during its "ontogeny." This process, in its perfect unconsciousness, is like reflex action, but it is far more wonderful, since in the earliest stages even nerve-tissue is absent and has itself to be formed. In the accuracy of its direction towards a useful end, it is the very counterpart of the most developed instinct; nor, if the impulses by which adult individuals are led to seek and to perform those processes which give rise to the embryo, are to be called instinctive, is it easy to see how the analogical use of the term "instinctive" can be refused to that impulse by which each developing embryo is led to go through those processes which give rise to the adult. The action of each organism during its individual development may be compared, and has evidently much affinity with, the processes of nutrition and the repair and reproduction of parts lost through some injury. These processes of nutrition and repair have also evidently a close relation to reflex action, and reflex action has also a close affinity to instinctive action. Instead, however, of explaining "instinct" by "reflex action," I would rather explain reflex action, processes of nutrition, processes of repair, processes of individual development, by instinct—using this term in a wide analogical sense. For we know the wonderful action and nature of instinct as it exists in our own human activity, standing, as it were, at the head of the various unconsciously intelligent vital processes. These processes seem to me to be all diverse manifestations of what is fundamentally one kind of activity. Of these manifestations, instinctive action is the best type, because by it we can, to a certain extent, understand the others, whereas none of the others enable us to understand instinct.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.



## THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE.

### I.—IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

THE movement for Imperial Federation has grown apacé. Within a very brief period it has taken such possession of the press that it is now a household word in politics. Its friends are to be found in both political camps, and it has on its side the powerful advocacy of Mr. Forster in the one House, and of the new First Commissioner of Works, Lord Rosebery, in the other. The former has recently defined it as "such a union of the mother-country with her colonies as will keep the realm one State in relation to other States," and he argues that unless "some organization for common defence and a joint foreign policy" is effected, the inevitable consequence of the self-government of the colonies will be their separation and independence. Mr. Forster recognises the impracticability of direct colonial representation in our Parliament, with the members for the colonies voting on matters of home legislation; and he deems the other scheme premature of an Imperial Parliament overriding our own no-less than those of the colonies. He would appear to favour a Federal Council, consisting of colonial agents who should act as a Board of Advice to the Cabinet or Colonial Secretary, to confer on all matters of peace and war, treaties, defences, and the respective contributions to such defences of the several members of the union. Such union, he maintains, would tend to peace, and above all to a saving of cost, since nothing is so costly as war, and an organization for common defence an almost certain insurance against it.

The year 1884 was certainly a golden first step in the path of this theory that union is economy, and that expense for the defence of that union is likely to be less costly than war itself. At present it looks as if union might come to mean bankruptcy, and the cost of defence actually exceed the cost of war. A large additional expenditure was incurred by the country last year for its so-called colonial defences, and a far larger expenditure for the strengthening of the navy. But there is yet time to draw up before we advance farther on this brilliant road to ruin. Whilst we are yet but at the beginning of the bill, we can pause to estimate the pecuniary charges that will next be required of us. We can consider what prominent advisers like Captain Colomb and Mr. Baden-Powell, whom we have followed so far, deem essential for the safety of our Colonial Empire. According to the former, we must first of all have a large arsenal at Sydney or Bombay to serve as the naval base for our ships in war time in the eastern part of our empire, where they may safely coal and repair and get ammunition. For, "to protect the trade lines in the Pacific Ocean, with its ninety million square miles of water, we shall in war require an enormous fleet. That fleet should be entirely independent

of Atlantic dockyards, and a great Imperial dockyard at the other side of the world is an apparent necessity."

This enormous fleet and Imperial dockyard is a costly idea enough to begin with, and after it we can think with comparative complacency of the subordinate necessity of not only occupying but of garrisoning and fortifying certain strategic points like St. Helena, Vancouver's Island, and other places, which command all the lines of oceanic communication between Great Britain and her colonies, and lie at the mercy of an hostile attack. For "our fleets cannot keep the sea," says the Captain, "without the support of an army distributed strategically over the face of the globe to secure their bases." Nor, even with this enormous fleet and enormous army, are we safe yet, for above all things we must fortify strongly our coal depôts, on which in war the successful movements of our fleets must depend, and some of which might now be destroyed in a few hours by a single ship with a few guns; we must secure them against bombardment or capture, by means of port defence vessels and torpedoes, and, of course, of men specially trained to work them. All very well, if John Bull's pockets were bottomless! Captain Colomb's ideas strike one as Imperial enough, but what shall be said of Mr. Baden-Powell's, who postulates as many as six large arsenals as essential to Imperial defence; at Jamaica, as the West Indian centre; at Sydney, as the Australian; at Bombay, to command the Indian seas, and so forth? In these arsenals our ironclads might stay and destroy all cruisers against our commerce in distant seas. But besides these arsenals we must have at least sixteen fortified and garrisoned coal depôts to supply our ironclads with coal, and to shelter them in time of war. And the cost of all this? Only ten million pounds annually, of which the poor colonies might perhaps be asked for one, and India and the rich mother country pay the other nine! Rich mother country, indeed, whose daughters bid fair to become her ruin, driving her agriculturists to despair, and her arable and then her pasture-lands back to fell! Nine millions a year more than already comes out of her pocket, and this if she only contemplates a single enemy, and leaves out of all consideration the possibility of a coalition! How long, mother country, how long?

Are not, then, these schemes equivalent to saying, and would it not be better at once to say and have done with it, that our empire, with its extremities removed as far as possible from their basis, and with its lines of communication assailable on all sides, is from a naval and military point of view altogether defenceless, at least against any combined attack from two or more belligerents? And would not therefore absolute independence be a stronger security to our colonies than any military defence we can throw round them, and be as much our interest to confer as it would undoubtedly be their

interest to receive? The whole necessity for defence rests on a costly sentiment. Of course the Imperialist school rise far above all considerations of money, or, if they notice it, draw dazzling pictures of our loyal colonies growing richer and more populous, and vying with one another in their eagerness to contribute men and money to the purposes of Pananglicanism. Perhaps they might, but then they would be entitled to a voice in Pananglican policy, and to a more effective voice than the sending of a few representatives to London could possibly confer upon them. If Irish opinion in foreign policy is so little regarded at Westminster, what would be the influence of Australian, Canadian, or African? Very sensibly on this point wrote the *Sydney Morning Herald* of August 3, 1877:—"While we have no control over any diplomacy, no word to say about the Eastern question or any other question, no power to determine whether we shall go to war or remain at peace, there is no political reason for asking us to defray the cost of a war in which we have no choice, and perhaps no interest. There is nothing in this view of the case that is selfish; it is simply a corollary of the admitted doctrine that taxation and representation go together." Why, then, should they contribute to Imperial expenditure?

But of course all schemes of Imperial Federation presuppose the admission of the colonies to the Imperial council-room. And this is their insuperably weak point. The present tie between us and our colonies is one of suzerainty on the one side and of vassalage on the other. Why should we surrender our position of paramount supremacy, and either descend to political equality with our subject colonies, or raise them to our political level? There can be no empire without subject dependencies. Only the other day (January 12) all our newspapers published a manifesto from the Prime Minister of Victoria, wherein, after complaining that in Imperial matters the colonies were subject to an "unqualified" or "antiquated autocracy," the humiliation of which position was "keenly felt," he went on to say, that whatever scheme of federation was decided upon, "while it cannot take from us anything that we at present possess, must give to the colonies more tangible influence and more legal and formal authority than they have now." In other words, all the giving is to be on our side, all the receiving on that of the colonies.

Even if we were so pusillanimous as to part with our sovereignty, how would the scale of contribution to Imperial expenses be apportioned, not only between ourselves and the colonies, but between the several colonies themselves? No scheme of federation yet propounded supplies an answer to preliminary questions of this sort. It is all left as vague as a Scotch mist, or as sentimental as a Scotch romance. The Imperialist school boast that they have silenced their opponents, the Separationists. They have really but added force to the arguments of the latter: arguments, be it remembered, which

derive their primary inspiration from an authority as unimpeachable as Adam Smith, and which have never yet been answered (for Mr. Forster's appeal to Raleigh and to sentiment is no answer at all), though the changes that have since occurred in the world or in its customs have added to them, tenfold cogency. "The argument for colonial separation is partly military and partly commercial; and from both of these points of view the balance of advantages, both for ourselves and our colonies, can easily be shown to lie with the political independence of the latter.

Take, first, the case of war. The possible hostility of foreign powers to the colonies rests solely on their dependence on us, the question of colonial defence ceasing altogether with the political connection. It is only as our colonies that Australia need think of Russia, or Canada have any fear of the United States. What advantage do Sydney or Melbourne derive from their political connection with Great Britain that is not far more than compensated for by their liability, in the event of an Anglo-Russian war, of suffering bombardment, invasion, and military requisitions at the hands of Russia? Vladivostok, the Russian naval base in the Pacific, is only five thousand miles from Sydney; Mare Island, the Pacific naval arsenal of the United States, is only six thousand four hundred and sixty miles distant from the same; we have no naval arsenal nearer than Portsmouth or Plymouth. What a panic consequently there was a few years ago, in Victoria, when the *Age* newspaper printed a secret despatch purporting to be from a Russian admiral, wherein he explained that he could levy war-contributions from the Australian colonies to the amount of twelve millions sterling! And into what an ignominious panic does not every rumour of war throw our hapless dependencies! What piteous appeals for help come to us from every colonial governor! "I earnestly beg help for poor colony, strategically important," telegraphed the governor of Tasmania to the English Colonial Minister on the 21st of May, 1877, when there was some danger of a Russian war; and one poor colony is a fair sample of all.

And what a dissolvent of colonial loyalty is not every such anxious period! What said the *Brisbane Courier* of June 11 in that same year? "Great as is the support we now receive from our intimate and attached relationship to the mother country, it would be in vain to deny that in the event of war the interests of British commerce and of international comity might be subserved in a higher and more Imperial sense by the absolute independence of the federated Canadian or Australian Colonies than they could be by the fortification of strategic points." Of course they would; and read again the *Queenslander* of August 4, 1877: "We are aware that there is in Victoria a political party which is in favour of neutralising that colony. But what naval power at war with England would consent to such a neutrality? A successful raid upon Melbourne would be worth

from five millions to ten millions to the war-chest of the nation making it; and Victoria, in order to neutralise, must first denationalise herself."

The military advantages of separation are of course closely allied with the commercial; and here, again, the colonies are becoming aware of their real interests. The *Colonist* of August 21, 1877, said with reason: "Now that the neutral flag is recognised as a protection to cargo, it would not need many losses nor any long period of paying war-premiums to convince colonial merchants and the people suffering from the larger prices of everything they had to buy, and the lower prices of what they had to sell; that their advantage was to be found in independence." And what do we on our side gain from artificially limiting the field from which in time of war food could come to us? If cargoes could come to us from Australia, or Canada, or elsewhere, with the same immunity from attack with which, by the present laws of war, they could now come to us from the United States if we were at war with France or Russia, is it not obvious that the gain would be on both sides, if the colonies sent ships to sea under their own independent flags?

These are positive, tangible, and intelligible advantages associated with separation. On the other side, the advantages of federation or union are of an unreal, sentimental nature. No one tells us at all definitely what they are. The case for separation stands or falls with the estimate of the balance of material advantages, and its case shall be admitted to have broken down when it has been shown that the preponderance of advantage is on the other side. But it must be shown by rational, not emotional, argument. When Dr. Lang, a few years ago, brought forward a motion in New South Wales—that the time had come for that colony to sever her tie with England—it was proposed by an opponent that the motion should be thrown on the floor of the House, and be thence swept away by the common hangman. But it is not in this way in the long run that communities settle questions affecting their permanent interests. One would, indeed, hardly look upon our colonies as worthy of the best traditions of their race, if they did not look to ultimate autonomy as the goal of their ambition. The extent to which they do so is at present matter of surmise; but it remains to add an indication of the undercurrent of political thought in Canada to that wherewith the Australian papers have already supplied us. The *Montreal Daily Star* of April 12, 1882, quoted these words from the president of a national club at Montreal: "Our position is a dependent one, and we are not only subjects of the Queen, but we are subjects of the Queen's subjects, and for my own part I shall never feel comfortable while such a state of things exists. . . . We have no antipathies against our neighbours, and would highly prize the honour of forming part of the American Republic, but we aspire to higher destinies, and desire to see founded here a Canadian Republic and a Canadian nationality."

This is plain speaking enough, and finer than the fulsome language with which colonial orators generally belaud their condition of political pupillage. Whatever sentiments we may cherish about the value of the connection, and however much wealth we may be prepared to waste for its maintenance, we should not forget that there is also the colonial point of view, and that this under the stress of any serious war might quickly assert itself in a manner which might surprise us, but of which we have had ample warning. The political tie may go, but the moral tie will remain; and this is the answer to the first plea of the Imperialists, that union or federation is a good in itself and diminishes the area of possible warfare. But a moral union is the only thing that matters, and the only tie permanently possible between communities so distant from one another as Great Britain and her colonies. Between friendly communities a political tie is as little needed as between the same communities when at discord it is valueless. What other is the moral of the history of the origin of the United States? A common origin, common speech and history, make an indestructible moral federation and render a political federation unimportant. In the wars that the future may have in store for us, are we not as likely to derive material aid from the alliance of our separated colonies as from the allegiance which our remaining colonies still owe us by virtue of their political subjection?

The next argument of the Imperialists is that trade follows the flag, a theory that is also conclusively dispelled by an appeal to the case of America. How was trade affected by the severance of our connection with the United States? "All the world knows," says Mr. Merivale, "that the commerce between the mother country and the colonies was but a peddling traffic compared to that vast international intercourse, the greatest the world has ever known, which grew up between them when they had exchanged the tie of subjection for one of equality." Why then should not the same effect follow the same cause in the case of our other colonies? Or if there is any commercial benefit we derive from our dependencies that we should not equally derive from them as independent communities, why should it not be shown what it is? It is notorious that most of our colonies set as high prohibitive rates against us as foreign countries, and that our colonial trade is quite insignificant compared with that with independent communities. Our annual export trade with the latter is about 70 per cent. as against 30 per cent. with our colonies and India besides, whilst our annual imports from the colonies and India amount to no more than 24 per cent. of the whole. Of course as the colonies grow our trade with them will increase, but that increase will be clearly independent of the political connection, and be quite indifferent to the flag. The notion of trade following the flag is simply a survival of the feeling that was our original motive in founding colonies at all. We wished to have a monopoly

of trade with customers in all quarters of the globe, who should be obliged to buy their goods at the home-producer's price, free from all foreign competition. In two wars of the last century that chimera cost us as much as two hundred million pounds; but with the old trade privileges gone, and high colonial tariffs against us, it would seem rather absurd to think it worth while to spend much money on the defence of the colonies.

Lastly, the argument that the colonies afford a useful outlet for our emigrating classes is the weakest of all. They are such an outlet of course, but only as unoccupied countries, not as colonies. Germany without as yet a colony in the world, disposes annually of 200,000 emigrants, and so far is love for his country's flag from being the first consideration of the English colonist, that of the 9,000,000 who have emigrated between 1817 and 1879, nearly 6,000,000, or two-thirds of the whole, have gone to the United States in preference to going to our own colonies. Even in the years when civil war was raging in the United States, the percentage of English emigration to the States was as high as 65, as against 35 to our own colonies; between the years 1866 and 1870 the percentage to the States was as high as 78.

What advantage then is there from the connection, for the sake of which we should continue on the career of limitless expenditure upon which, by ill advice, we have entered? None whatever. If there is, what is it? Do we derive from them tribute, or open markets, or any military aid at all equivalent to the two million pounds which still figure in the army estimates to the account of the colonies? Do we or our colonies derive additional security or strength, and not rather weakness and danger from it? Let the friends of Imperialist federation state the assignable advantages that are to flow from it, or if they cannot, let them bring forward solid arguments to prove that the policy of separation has not much more in its favour than the opposite policy of federation. For the Separationist, too, may indulge in his dream of a greater Britain, of an English Empire conterminous with English speech, cemented, not by unnatural and gulling political bonds, but by the sympathies of free communities, and by the affections of equal allies, who, inheriting the same traditions of popular rights, will be ever zealous of one another's welfare and sensitive of one another's honour, and whose union, thus founded, will be more potent against external foes than the wildest scheme of military defence or the most reckless outpouring of the savings of the tax-payer. The Separationist may seem little likely just at present to have his way, but, since both in sentiment and in logic he has the last word, he has no need to despair of the future, more especially as none are doing more to enlighten public opinion in the sense he would wish than the fanciful advocates of Imperial Federation.

J. A. FARRER.

## II.—THE IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE.

THE promoters of the movement bearing the above high-sounding title have recently, through their chairman, condescended upon some particulars as to their objects. • But Mr. Forster's allocation does not tell us much that we did not know before. He hints indeed at a "Board of Advice" to the Cabinet composed of the "Agents General" to represent colonial opinion on foreign policy, but as this suggestion was made five years ago by Lord Grey, it can scarcely be regarded as new matter in reference to this subject. The Imperial Federation League must, therefore, be judged by its already published programme, which has been more than six months before the world. The framers of its constitution, who began their work last July, start with the assumption that there are problems of colonial policy the solution of which cannot without peril be indefinitely delayed, and they go on to warn us that the British Empire, if not in some form confederated, will shortly be disintegrated. They tell us that though imperial England is doing her best to keep up appearances in the management of her five-and-forty dependencies, the political links which once bound them to each other and to their common centre are evidently wearing out. It must be admitted that there is a sense in which those who have no sympathy with these gloomy predictions participate in some degree in the anxieties naturally incident to a period of transition in our colonial policy. Misgivings haunt the public mind as to the stability of an edifice which seems to be founded on a reciprocity of deception, and only to be shored up for the time by obsolete and meaningless traditions. Even orthodox politicians, who would shrink from a colonial emancipationist as from a pestilent heretic, cannot help asking themselves sometimes whether it is on the cards that these little islands of ours, whose whole area scarcely exceeds 130,000 square miles, should for ever hold, under even a nominal dominion, a fifth of the habitable globe. It is apparently in the hope of furnishing an affirmative answer to this last question that the founders of the Imperial Federation League have held two meetings and passed eight resolutions, the sum and substance of which appears to be that in a federation of some sort is to be found the remedy for all our colonial difficulties, our safeguard against disintegration, and our guarantee for the permanent unity of the Empire. No limits are imposed to the operation of the League. All the dependencies of the British Empire are to be included. Self-governing colonies with free parliaments of their own; Crown colonies in which no representative element exists; naval stations and fortified posts maintained, for no other purpose than as barracks for our troops, coaling stations for our ships, or for the protection of the courses of our trade. Those vast provinces to which we have freely conceded the absolute control



of their own affairs, are to be banded with the isolated garrisons of our fragmentary Empire in one grand and comprehensive scheme of universal federation. If any distinction in this respect between Cyprus and New South Wales, or between the Canadian Dominion and Hong Kong is intended, at all events no such distinction is expressed. All individuals who pay a shilling as registration fee, and all dependencies who choose to form branches of the League are invited to affiliate themselves therewith.

The British Empire comprises at present about twenty Crown colonies, seven colonies or groups in which some representative element exists, and ten in which absolutely free parliaments possessing "responsible Government" have been created. In this latter enumeration the Dominion of Canada with its constituent provinces is counted as one, but might be reckoned as seven. The Federation League have not yet told us whether they contemplate the eventual fusion of British India in the political crucible of the future; but for the present, perhaps, they will have almost enough on their hands without inviting the two hundred and fifty millions of Hindostan to join their union.

If we are to treat seriously a scheme propounded or supported by persons who, having held high office at home or abroad, challenge our attention, it is absolutely necessary that they should tell us what they really mean. As yet their outline is too indistinct and their programme too vague to enable us to do more than conjecture the limits of the one and speculate on the objects of the other. As at present advised, we can only suppose that these excellent gentlemen, frightened at theories which, as they think, tend to the dismemberment of the Empire, hope to galvanise it into new life by what they call "imperial federation." It is possible that they may have been encouraged to embark in a scheme so visionary by some supposed precedents or experiments of grouping colonies. The only example of this kind which can be cited is that of the Dominion of Canada, which had its origin, not in any scheme formed by theorists at home, but in the Quebec Conference of 1864. The only other attempt at grouping was that more recently devised in Downing Street for our South African colonies, which, as might have been anticipated, entirely failed. The notion of clubbing together such incongruous elements as the old Cape Colony with its responsible Government and the outlying Boer Republics, which can be scarcely said to have any Government at all, into a federation of which two-thirds were to be Dutchmen, and not more than one in every thirty of the population of any European descent at all, was indeed sufficiently chimerical.

We have heard something lately of a "Sydney Conference," at which representatives from six colonies in Australasia met to draft resolutions which were to be the basis of a Bill creating a "Federal

Council of Australasia." This took place in December, 1883. By s. 30 of the Bill so framed it was provided that even this very modified form of federation should not take effect in any colony until its Legislature should have approved of the same. Up to the present time the oldest and most important colony of the group has declined to pass such a Bill, and the proceedings of the conference threaten to be of no effect. Whether the amendments since suggested by Lord Derby, still further limiting the effect of the Bill, will be adopted, remains to be seen. As an illustration of the indisposition to federate in Australia, I may mention that when I was there four years ago a conference for the purpose of assimilating the laws and tariffs of the various colonies was held at Sydney, but the only point on which they could all agree was in prohibiting or taxing the immigration of Chinese. If Australasia should ever follow the example of Canada, and confederate its seven provinces, they may fairly be left to themselves to settle all details, such, for instance, as the choice of a capital, a crucial difficulty in all federations. But whether the experiment fail or succeed, it will have no bearing whatever on the problem raised by the Imperial Federation League, which is the combination, not of contiguous provinces of identical interests, language, and origin, but of all the scattered fragments of an Empire comprising almost all the races, languages, and religions of the habitable world. If the time should arrive when we may be invited to consider seriously such proposals as are now submitted to us, we shall surely be first bound to ask ourselves what are the *existing ties* between the parent State and its dependencies, and the existing powers and privileges of both.

All our free colonies, comprising the North American, Australian, and South African, have not only an absolute control over their own internal affairs, but the power of taxing all imports from the parent State, while their shores and the courses of their trade are protected by imperial fleets. They have territorial revenues, applicable either to the development of public works, or to the importation of labour, or any other purpose. They have, moreover, the advantage of a free influx of immigrants into their ports, and a free efflux of capital from our money market. If any European Power adopts a policy in reference to criminals or to other matters prejudicial to the interests of the colonies, such an outrage would, under the relations now existing between Great Britain and her colonies, justify imperial intervention by diplomacy, or, if necessary, by force. It is difficult to see how, in the interests of our colonial fellow-subjects, these relations can be improved. But one thing is certain, that no supposed advantages of an imperio-colonial council, whether for the purpose of regulating their external defence or internal government, will tempt them to surrender one iota of the privileges of self-government now possessed by their provincial parliaments. So long as the

Queen's representative leaves his responsible ministers to take their own course, his titular authority will be respected; but the moment this rule is departed from, and any attempt is made, either through an imperio-colonial council at home, or through any scheme of imperial representation, to create a counter-authority of any kind, the slender links now existing are far more likely to be snapped asunder than strengthened.

In connection with the Federation League, hints have been recently revived of some scheme for the representation of the colonies in the Imperial Parliament. This question has been so ably disposed of by others, that it may be sufficient to remark that the only authorities commonly cited in its favour, such as Adam Smith and Edmund Burke, are of a date long preceding the inauguration of "responsible government"—a system wholly inconsistent with any co-ordinate imperial representation. This system, first established in Canada in 1841, has since been extended to the Cape Colony, and (with the exception of Western Australia and Fiji) to all the Australian colonies; and as all these have not only free Parliaments, but authorised "Agents-General" in England, it is difficult to imagine what function is left to be performed by imperial representatives, however chosen, or councils, however constituted.

There are, indeed, colonies in which, though "responsible government" has not been established, some representative element exists, as at the Bermudas, British Guiana, the Bahamas, and the Leeward and Windward Islands. But as the two last named groups have, with the single exception of Barbadoes, voluntarily surrendered their constitutions, and the Leeward Islands have put themselves under a half-nominated Council, it can hardly be supposed that in those colonies, or in Jamaica, which has voluntarily surrendered a constitution more than two hundred years old, any very great eagerness exists for the blessings offered by the Imperial Federation League. What is the inducement held out to the twenty Crown colonies now under our paternal Government, and sharing contentedly the common privilege of figuring as little red dots in the map of the world, to join the League, is still less apparent. The Falklands, Heligoland, Ascension, the West African settlements, St. Helena, Aden, and Hong Kong, are not very likely to trouble themselves on the subject. Nor even in the more considerable colonies of this class, such as Mauritius, Ceylon, or Trinidad, have there been any signs as yet of any dissatisfaction with their present recognition as "integral portions of the Empire." But perhaps we shall be told that we have overlooked one important item in the programme of the Federation League, contained in the fourth of their resolutions: "That any scheme of Imperial Federation should combine on an equitable basis the resources of the Empire, for the maintenance of common interests, and adequately provide for an organized defence of common rights." To a resolu-

tion so vaguely worded it is difficult to attach any definite meaning. The "maintenance of common interests and defence of common rights" may have a commercial, political, or military significance. If the commercial relations between Great Britain and her colonies constitute the common interests adverted to, it is certainly much to be desired that these relations were placed on a more "equitable basis." The tariffs of Canada and Victoria—more adverse to our trade than those of many countries of Continental Europe—leave, indeed, much to be desired in the direction of "equity." But it is not by imperial federation that these equities can be secured or these relations readjusted.

If, again, it is intended by this resolution to suggest that the military and naval defence of the Empire against foreign aggression is likely to be more effectually secured than at present by any system of federation, it will be well to ascertain our actual position in this respect. If it is meant to affirm that in return for the protection afforded to our colonies by the British fleets occupying our North American, Pacific, and Australian stations, they should be prepared to furnish their quota of military aid in the event of an invasion—for instance, of India by Russia, or of Great Britain by France—the obvious answer to such a suggestion is, that the colonies are not responsible for the protection of themselves, still less of the mother country, from perils arising from the consequences of imperial policy over which they had no control. We have recently heard of a Royal Commission on Colonial Defences, but as its report has never been published it has not contributed to our stock of information. But if we turn to the report of a parliamentary committee on the same subject in 1861, on which four members of the present Cabinet—Lord Derby, Lord Northbrook, Mr. Childers, and Lord Carlingford, also Lord Salisbury and other leading men of both parties—served, and before which Mr. Gladstone, Lord Grey, the late Lord Herbert, and the then Inspector-General of Fortifications gave evidence, we shall find the basis on which the mutual relations between Great Britain and her colonies, in the matter of their defence, have ever since rested. Our self-governing colonies accepted, on the one hand, the principle of self-reliance for their internal defences, as is proved by the fact that the North American and Australian colonies (which, in 1860, were garrisoned by over seven thousand British troops, at an annual cost of more than half a million sterling) are now wholly defended by their own volunteers and militia. The Home Government, on the other hand, formally accepted, by a resolution of the House of Commons founded on the report of this committee, its responsibility for the protection of all portions of the British Empire "against perils arising from the consequences of imperial policy." Recognising the tendency of modern warfare to strike blows at the heart of a hostile power, and the consequent necessity for concentrat-

ing at home a large portion of the land forces of England, this committee assumed that on our *naval* supremacy we should mainly depend for securing against foreign aggression the distant dependencies of our Empire.

By what conceivable scheme of "federation," it may well be asked, could these relations be improved in the matter of defence in the interests of the colonies? During the last twenty years the vigour of our Australian colonists has shown itself not only in improving their internal defences by organizing their volunteers, but by providing ships. They are reported to have now vessels of an aggregate tonnage of over seven thousand tons; besides torpedo boats, gun-boats, and fixed batteries. But, of course, these colonies must mainly rely for the present on British ships of war for the protection of their ports, and of the courses of their trade. There are now about nine such ships on the Australian station, and if the action of European Powers in the South Pacific should render a larger naval force necessary it would at once be provided.

But if the 4th resolution of the Federation League has little practical application to our American and Australian dependencies, it is obvious that to our Crown colonies and India it can have none at all. Our Mediterranean garrisons are kept at full strength mainly for the purpose of reinforcing the seventy British battalions held necessary for India; and in the present condition of South Africa our imperial responsibilities for any frontier wars in which we may be involved there hold out little prospect of modification by any new arrangements. On the whole, then, imperial federation cannot be said to offer us any improvement in the matter of imperial defence. If "Greater Britain" were nothing more than a scattered multitude of territorial atoms welded together by military force, like those which yielded to the spear of the Roman, the bond of federation, or any other likely to subserve, under the guise of liberty, the purposes of arbitrary power, might perhaps suggest itself. What might have been the effect of any such machinery in prolonging the rule of Spain, Portugal, Holland, or France, which preceded England in the path of colonisation, and have since lost the greater portion of their empires, it is impossible to say; but it is precisely because England has abandoned the objects of tribute or monopolies usually sought by dominant States in the government of dependencies that no artificial links are needed to secure the loyalty of her subject provinces.

It is too late to speculate whether bargains might have been made long ago with our colonies for their own self-defence or for free trade with us as the price for the concession of self-government. Such stipulations, if attempted, would probably have failed. Now, at all events, our trust for friendly tariffs and for co-operation in the defence of the Empire must be on the influence of an enlightened public opinion on the free parliaments which we have ourselves created.

But it has recently been suggested that though federation may not

be needed for the normal purposes of Government, it might be of use in keeping off political poachers from our colonial manor. Several scares are current of foreign nations—notably Germany and France—as having designs on our preserves, and the notion that federation may be a specific against such dangers may have been encouraged by the offer lately held out to the Australian colonies, that if they would only confederate they should be allowed to annex 150,000 square miles of New Guinea. No connection between confederation and annexation seemed to exist but that of the cost of the proceeding, which in its initial steps would be quite insignificant compared with the ultimate imperial responsibility it would involve of protecting immigrants settling there under the supposed shelter of our flag. Judging from Dutch experience in New Guinea, where farmers are said to carry on their work with the spade in one hand and the musket in the other, and traders to enforce their contracts at the point of the bayonet, Great Britain must be prepared for some “supplementary estimates” to support her protectorate, unless, like the Dutch, she can find some Malay sultan to act as suzerain in the Queen’s name. But whatever may happen in the Pacific, federation, if otherwise possible, would do nothing towards protecting our dependencies there against the aggression of other powers. Conceive the idea of an attack in force by the recidivists of New Caledonia on New South Wales or Queensland. It would not be by the mere sentiment of “imperial federation,” but by the batteries of Lytton and Port Jackson, supported by British ironclads, that such an attack would be repelled. If Germany again conceives the notion of planting a few settlements at St. Lucia Bay, Angra Pequena, or elsewhere on the coast of Africa (which continent has still some ten millions of unoccupied square miles open to the colonists of the world), what security against German aggression would Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, or the Cape Colony derive from imperial federation? The real truth is that, whether in time of peace or of war, for purposes of military defence or of political progress, imperial federation has no practical applicability to our colonial Empire. Mr. Forster, the chairman of this league, addressing an audience of sympathetic federationists, who appear to have had some misgivings as to the working of their scheme, encouraged them with the well-known watchword of “Where there’s a will there’s a way.” “But,” says Mr. Morley, “the will depends on the way, and the more any possible way of federation is considered the less likely is there to be the will.” Mr. Forster cites the story in the Croker Papers of the Duke of Wellington’s successful guesses as to “what was on the other side of the hill.” He may rest assured that, whatever guesses may be made about the “other side of the hill” he invites us to climb, the British people will think more than twice before they tempt the slippery slopes of imperial federation.

ARTHUR MILLS.

## SQUIRES, SPIRES, AND MIRES.

### I.—THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

"THE cause of the poor in heaven's name." Such—with a somewhat profane conclusion—was the toast proposed by the immortal Teufelsdröckh to the assembled intellect of the town of Weissnichtwo, and received with enthusiasm, although, as the meeting broke up, some were heard muttering that one day he would probably be hanged for his democratic sentiments. Possibly the wish was father to the thought. Deprecating for myself the predicted fate of its proposer, I adopt the toast, "The cause of the poor in heaven's name." But, first, what is meant by "the poor"? There is no term which has lent itself more completely to cant and conventionality, but neither cant nor conventionality have ever defined it. And define it no one can. It may be a term of respect or of reproach, and under it are included the honest, the industrious, and the independent, as well as the vicious, the idle, and the improvident. Without attempting a definition, I intend in this paper to limit the term to the agricultural labourer. Another word which cant and conventionality have made their own, and to define which is equally difficult, is "charity." In one sense it is the noblest of virtues, in another and the popular sense it has rightly been called the next most pernicious thing to vice. For the purposes of this paper it will be used in the popular sense, and an attempt will be made to show what it has done for the agricultural labourer, and to what noble deeds it appears to have stirred the hearts of one of his professed friends, namely, the country gentleman.

I am not going far afield, but shall confine myself to my own immediate neighbourhood, describing what I have seen and known. I do not intend to call in question the wisdom of existing laws or to suggest new ones. I have no programme of my own, but shall endeavour to point a plain moral by telling a plain tale. The tale is one of the country, not of the town, for of the "bitter cries" and "crying evils" of the towns I have no personal knowledge; besides, the tale of the towns has been told so often. It will be assumed that the country gentleman still desires to be thought what he, with the parson, has always claimed to be *par excellence*, the poor man's friend. The farmer has claimed it too, but in a less pronounced manner. His connection with "the poor" being more or less a business one, has scarcely allowed scope for the free play of his feelings of pure benevolence; and while the law of the land continues to offer him a direct inducement to escape his responsibilities and exercise his charitable feelings (when he has them) at other people's expense, it will be in the nature of things unlikely that he will have a very

elevated notion of his duty to his neighbour. "There is a deal of human nature in man," especially in farmers; nevertheless he, like the parson and the country gentleman, would resent the notion that he had not "the cause of the poor" at heart. We can recollect how bitterly it *was* resented some ten or twelve years ago, when the agitators of what was called "the labourer's movement" included squires, parsons, and farmers in one breath of abuse as the natural enemies of the labouring class. All of us who happened to be either squires, parsons, or farmers regarded such language as the rant of ignorance, and were only saved from loss of temper by a sense of the absurdity of the charge. But, then, was it so very absurd after all? "The tree is known by its fruits." Judged by its fruits, what shall we say of this friendship? What has it done for the labourer? What has it made of him? We have had him in hand, so to speak, for centuries. He was always ready to be led by the squire, and docile enough until lately under the teaching of the parson. Where have we led him to? What have we taught him? Have all our "charities," almshouses, clothing clubs, and out-door relief raised him in character and independence above the level he had reached centuries ago? Is he one whit a better man in any sense of the word than if we had let him alone? Is he not still content to be in leading-strings and ready as ever to sell his freedom for a dole? Has not the net result of the squire's leading and the parson's teaching been to impress the ordinary labourer with the belief that poverty is the best policy, and that improvidence is the surest road to the pockets if not to the hearts of his friends? Poor fruit this of so long a friendship.

But, for the present, leaving parsons and farmers out of the question, let us confine our attention to the country gentleman. What a splendid position is, or at any rate, has been, his! Opportunities for good which are denied to most men—possessing wealth and influence and ample leisure. He is supposed to be, and as a rule is, a man of some education, and as a matter of course a Christian. As regards "the poor," his position has been almost that of providence itself. He is the owner of the homes they live in, the ground they cultivate, I had almost said the air they breathe. It is hardly too much to say their fortunes are subject to his guidance and control. They are his "dependents." He is their law and their gospel too, their patron if not their patron saint. Of a stewardship such as this what account can he give? I happen to live in what may fairly be considered a typical county. If in anything it differs from others, it is in the numbers of its squires and country gentlemen. It is what is called an aristocratic county, and especially a hunting county. In addition to the resident country gentlemen there are a number of wealthy men who have settled in the county simply and solely for hunting purposes, owning good houses and maintaining large establish-



ments, but occupying little or no land, and repudiating apparently every obligation but the supreme one of pleasing themselves. Of these some are merely birds of passage, so to speak, renting their houses only for the hunting season, and naturally resenting the idea that any responsibility attaches to them in regard to the parish or neighbourhood in which they are pleased to hibernate.

It is about a county such as this, alive with squires and men of wealth, that my plain tale has to be told. Let it not be supposed that the state of things described is peculiar to this neighbourhood. On the contrary, it may fairly be taken as a sample of the conditions of rural life and of the way in which the duties belonging to a country gentleman, and especially those which affect the "poor," are, I will not say discharged, but regarded. Some twelve years ago, in the very heart of this wealthy district, and during a period of general prosperity, the guardians of the rural union to which I belong were called to task for the amount they were spending in relief to the poor. An inquiry was called for and instituted, and the report showed that, with every outward sign of wealth, and in the very midst of prosperity evidenced in a thousand ways, one person in every twelve was a pauper. Nor was this appalling amount of pauperism confined to the large and open, and as they are called "poor" parishes. It was worse in the close parishes where one owner reigns supreme, and in model villages where charity abounded, pauperism was more pronounced than in any other quarter. It is not here contended that the reproach of such a state of things lies entirely at the country gentleman's door, but can it be denied that it bears witness to a want of thought or a want of heart painful to contemplate on the part of those who posed as the poor man's friends, among whom, naturally, the country gentleman takes precedence? And indeed it seems hard to believe that a man should interest himself successfully in regulating the number of his pheasants, or should feel himself almost disgraced when his covers are drawn blank, and yet should acknowledge no responsibility and feel no shame as to the number of paupers in the parish he owns and controls. It is absurd as well as untrue to plead that he is helpless in the matter; it is worse than absurd to plead ignorance. By virtue of his position, and apparently for no other reason, he is a magistrate, and as such he is an *ex-officio* guardian. It is his business to know, and further, it lies within his power, to determine the number of paupers on the estate which he represents or in the parish with which he is connected. Everyone at all conversant with the proceedings of a rural board of guardians is perfectly well aware that the influence which the landed proprietor can exercise on the decisions of the board, as to the relief of cases in which he is, or ought to be, interested, is almost irresistible, and I have no hesitation in saying that the condition of the rural union referred to, was

mainly due to the culpable indifference—to call it by no harsher name—of the country gentleman.

My story, unfortunately, does not end here. The inquiry and the report alluded to led to a reform in the administration of the law. Certain recommendations were proposed and carried into effect, which produced an immediate result in a very surprising and, as some thought, a cruel diminution in the number of cases which had up to that time been in receipt of out-door relief. The facts and figures connected with the work of reform obtained for the union a certain notoriety, and were referred to in the House of Lords in support of a motion brought forward by the late Lord Lyttleton in the direction of a further restriction of out-door relief. In the immediate neighbourhood, the proceedings of the board created much excitement. The guardians were divided among themselves, and part held with the reformers and part with those who thought the reform unnecessary, or at any rate too severe, and the relations between the two parties for a time were, to put it mildly, somewhat "strained." Among the poor themselves, as was natural, there were great searchings of heart—it was a vital question for them—and no one who had their interests really at heart could fail to be moved one way or another by what was taking place. Indifference was impossible to a real friend of the poor. It is clear that those who held that reform was called for, and that a remedy had to be applied with firmness if the disease was to be cured, were bound to maintain their view at any cost to themselves. Those, on the contrary, who held it to be unnecessary, or who thought it was being carried out with undue harshness and severity, were equally bound to resist it to the utmost of their power. The one course which no real friend of the poor could possibly take was, as has been said, that of indifference. That, nevertheless, was the course taken by the country gentlemen. At first there was a good deal of talk and excited discussion, and occasional attendance at the board when hunting or shooting—the real business of life—permitted it; but even this soon died away. As to anything like serious consideration or self-denying and persistent effort such as men will devote to a cause they have at heart, there was not then, and there is not now, the smallest evidence one way or another. In this I speak of what I know.

There is probably nothing connected with country life of which the country gentleman is so absolutely ignorant as the inside of his friend the labourer's cottage. How can it be otherwise? He never visits his friend; that's not his business. He leaves that to the women and the parson. Occasionally he looks in at the cottage of some old retainer on his way back from church, or takes a friend to see the outside of a new idea in cottage-building of which he is justly proud, and thinks how "deuced comfortable those labourers are after all." But that is the extent of his personal knowledge of the subject.

Perhaps it is therefore ignorance rather than indifference which is chiefly responsible for such a state of things as the following description of a village in the union already referred to discloses. I quote from a report made a few months ago to the sanitary authority of the union to which I belong by a committee appointed to inquire into the origin of a fever which had broken out in the place:—

“ . . . . At a block of six cottages . . . . where the fever originated, and where there have recently been outbreaks of fever and small-pox, six cases of fever have occurred. . . . One of these cottages is occupied by a man and his wife and five young children; they have but one bedroom. . . . The next cottage which your committee report upon is one occupied by A., with his wife and three children, who have but one bedroom. Two children here have died of the fever; until death reduced the family there were seven persons sleeping in the one room. The drains from the cottage are entirely blocked. . . . In a cottage occupied by B., a widow with five children and a grandson, namely, a son aged twenty-five, a daughter aged nineteen, three more sons aged seventeen, fifteen, and eleven respectively, and a grandson aged five, there is but one bedroom. . . . In a cottage occupied by C., a tailor, there are four grown-up persons sleeping in one room, namely, the father and mother and a grown-up son and daughter. The mother and daughter have both had the fever. . . . A cottage occupied by D., who with his wife and five children sleep in one bedroom, which, though small, is open to the roof. The next-door neighbour under the same roof has but one bedroom, in which sleep the father and grown-up son and daughter; there are indeed two beds, but the room is so small that there is barely two feet between them. . . . Your committee report upon a row of five cottages. . . . In one occupied by E. there is but one bedroom, part of which is partitioned off, and forms what looks more like a cupboard than a room, without door, or window, or fireplace. In this one room with its open cupboard a family of eight have been brought into the world, and, with the father and mother, still use it as their sleeping-place. Two sons and one daughter are grown up, and the rest, consisting of three sons and two daughters, are under sixteen. The grown-up daughter has just been sent to the workhouse to be confined (she returned in a fortnight's time with her child). In another cottage occupied by F., with his wife and five children, there is but one bedroom, reached by a broken staircase, the two bottom steps of which have disappeared. There is, indeed, a small loft or attic in the roof, reached by a step-ladder through a trap-door; but as it has no window, and as the trap-door is broken and cannot be opened, it is never used. . . . In a third, occupied by G. with his wife and four children, there are two small bedrooms, but only one is used, because the other is so damp. There are no back premises. . . . The man and all his children have had the fever. . . . In a cottage occupied by H. there is but one room up-stairs and one down-stairs. In the latter are two beds, in one of which lies Mrs. H., bedridden; the other is used by her husband. Five grown-up men, a child, and the woman who waits on Mrs. H. sleep in the bedroom. . . . In a cottage occupied by I. there is but one bedroom; the family are father and mother, two grown-up sons, and one grown-up daughter . . . they all sleep in the same room. . . . When your committee were there they found, in addition to the usual occupants, a married son with his wife and child, staying on a visit. . . .”

Such is a plain statement—the accuracy of which as an eye-witness I can vouch for—describing the condition of a portion of the cottage accommodation of the village. It must not be thought, however, that it is an exceptional case. I can answer for it that in the rural union of which it forms a part there are at least four villages where

the cottages are equally bad. Nor must it be concluded that there is anything peculiar in the village itself. It is an ordinary country village, with a squire and a parson, and all the usual charitable appliances. True, it is an open parish, but the land comprised in the parochial area is in the hands of two landowners who in their respective spheres are monarchs of all they survey. It has a "Hall" of its own, is surrounded by large estates, and is within sight of two if not three country houses. What has happened here is what has happened everywhere in this country. The country gentleman likes broad acres, but he hates cottage property. It spoils the view, it heads the fox, it creates responsibilities, and it doesn't pay. He says to his soul, "I will pull down my cottages and use other people's; the next parish can supply my estate with the labour it requires, and is it not an open one?" Thus a demand for cottages is created in the open parishes, hence the temptation to small tradesmen and others to run up miserable tenements unfit for human habitation; hence overcrowding, immorality, fever, pauperism. But why blame the country gentleman? Is it not lawful for him to do what he will with his own? Is he not, from one point of view, perfectly justified in freeing his estate from encumbrances, and weeding out from his particular parish every one who does not come up to his idea of respectability? Undoubtedly, so long as he remembers that the duty to himself is not the whole duty of a country gentleman. After all, human beings are not weeds which a man can throw over his neighbour's hedge and have done with; and even if they were, his neighbours might have just cause of complaint. But it is not thus easily that his responsibilities are escaped. In the act of thus trying to be rid of them he is creating fresh ones. What was before confined within the limits of his own estate is now extended, and becomes a responsibility shared with his neighbours, and which he has less right than before to shirk. More than ever he is bound to interest himself in the affairs, sanitary and other, of that parish of which he has made use. Can it be doubted that it rests with the country gentleman to remedy such a state of things as I have described, or to see that it is remedied? Not merely because he is a man of wealth, and education, and leisure, which he might well devote to "the cause of the poor," of which he is a professed champion, but because he is in so great a degree responsible for its existence; and yet, as a matter of fact, there is no part of his duties which he more systematically neglects. Here again he cannot plead ignorance; neither can he plead want of power, Parliament having expressly provided that he shall be ex-officio member of a sanitary authority whose business it is to deal with such cases, and whose powers, if properly and firmly used, are amply sufficient for this purpose. But, alas! Parliament proposes, the country gentleman disposes. There are no less than thirteen country gentlemen ex-officio members of the sanitary authority of the district referred

to, but not one of them attends its meetings or takes part in its proceedings.

What are we then to say of this friend of "the poor"? On questions which so vitally concern the labourer, questions which affect his wages, his character, his comfort, his body and soul, the country gentleman, who of all others is best qualified to guide and help him, proves to be of all others the least inclined to recognise his obligations. But perhaps he reserves himself for what he considers more important duties. He is before all things a magistrate, and at least once a fortnight he is supposed to attend petty sessions to administer justice. It is perhaps on the bench that the real value of the country gentleman is discovered, and there it is that he finds the proper sphere for his energies. Possibly it is so; I am unable to follow him there; I am obliged to imagine the administration of justice in the hands of one who has had no training for it, and who is a magistrate only because he is a country gentleman. As Dr. Johnson said of the dog that sat up, the wonder was not that it sat up *well*, but that it sat up *at all*. But granting all that the most ardent admirer of country justices can assert in their favour, it must be allowed that one day in a fortnight is not a very excessive demand upon a man's time, and leaves a somewhat broad margin for other duties. And it is at least conceivable that magisterial functions would be discharged none the less efficiently if the country gentleman qualified himself for them by a little personal acquaintance with the practical working of some of the acts which in the last resort he is called upon to enforce. \*

I notice that in a recent number of this Review the writer of the "Radical Programme" advocated certain clauses in the laws which affect the agricultural labourer. Blots are hit both in the Sanitary and in the Education Acts. But reforms in the law are not the only, perhaps not the chief, requirements of the case. We all know that a coach-and-four may be driven through most Acts of Parliament, and most country gentlemen can drive. My experience points to defects in administration rather than in the Acts themselves, and this in the direction of laxity rather than of undue severity, as implied in the article above referred to. It would be ill-natured and perhaps unfair to suppose that in these matters the country gentleman is influenced by a desire for popularity, or that he takes the opportunity afforded in such questions as these for qualifying severe sentences in matters which more nearly concern his own interests. The difficulty of obtaining a conviction for overcrowding, and the still greater difficulty of getting it enforced, may arise from the fact that the country gentleman has never realised by personal inspection what overcrowding means. The leniency too frequently displayed in enforcing the provisions of the Education Act may be due to a sense of the unfairness of compelling a labourer's child to qualify for "bird frighting" by passing Standard IV., while

no educational test whatever is required for "justicing." Whatever the motive may be, my experience points to the conclusion that the failure in the Sanitary and Education Acts is mainly owing to the uncertain action of the Bench.

There are other departments of country life to which attention might be drawn, in which the help of the country gentleman would be invaluable. It is indeed tantalising to think how much there is which lies within the reach of his influence. How comparatively easy for him to give the lead to his tenants, and to direct public opinion in his neighbourhood on questions largely affecting the community. How easy for him to give encouragement to thrift by an intelligent interest in the management of clubs and benefit societies, and by promoting co-operation, that best of boons to the labourer. How much good might be done by the exercise of an enlightened despotism over the public-houses which are under his control, or by taking an active part in the administration on sound principles of those village charities which as a rule are village curses; or what a really charitable application of money it would be for him to provide a skilled nurse for a neighbouring parish; the expense is but slight, less than the keep of a hunter, and without the initial cost. The sufferings and the lasting mischief arising from bad and ignorant nursing are really dreadful to think of. Then, again, why should he not buy up some miserable row of tenements in the next village and convert it into dwellings capable of being made into homes. It would cost something of course, but what in the name of all that is reasonable can be the sense of talking of charity that costs nothing, or complaining of cost at all with ten or a dozen horses in the stable? How easy too and insignificant the cost (if that must be thought of) to solve, or at any rate to simplify, the difficult and troublesome question in rural unions of what to do with pauper children, by taking upon himself the responsibility of such children who belong to his own parish or immediate neighbourhood, and either boarding them out under his own personal supervision, or, as has been done in some instances, admitting them into his own establishment to be educated and trained for service, and then sent out into the world with some happier idea of life than can be given within the work-house walls. It might be a little troublesome, but who ever heard of charity, except in the popular sense, which involved no trouble; and after all, the trouble falls less on the master or mistress than on the servants, and my experience goes to prove how ready they are to co-operate in such an undertaking.

In what has been said I have been careful to confine myself within the narrowest limits and to speak only from personal knowledge. Perhaps I shall be accused of being severe. My feeling is rather one of regret and sorrow. It seems so unspeakably sad to see powers for good running to waste. With so much to be done and so little time

for doing it, it is heartbreaking to see strong men looking on like the men of Meroz, while others with not a tithe of their power or wealth or leisure painfully and ineffectually attempt it. The pity of it is even worse than the shame. On the other hand it may be urged that I am unfair, and that I have been supposing powers and possibilities for good which do not now exist, whatever may have been the case in days gone by. In these hard times country gentlemen, it is said, have gone to the wall, and have lost their influence as well as their money. If this were altogether true, what must be thought of a class of men who succumb thus easily at a touch of adversity? As a matter of fact, however, it is only partially true. There are the men and there is the money in abundance still. Country sports and pleasures are thriving as ever, and show no signs of declining for want of either. And in so far as there is any truth in what is asserted, it would seem not altogether unfair to suppose that it has been brought about in a great degree by that very neglect of duty which I have remarked upon.

Let me not, however, be misunderstood. I am not pleading for heroic sacrifices, I am not suggesting that the country gentleman should be one whit less keen in the pursuit of manly pleasures. I am the last man to ask him to forego his hunting and his shooting. I am not complaining that he does not accept a programme sketched out for him by philanthropists. My complaint is limited to this, that he neglects the plain duties which lie at his very door, and which require nothing from him beyond a little self-denial; that on matters of local administration properly belonging to him, and which are really of vital importance to the community, and especially to the labourer, the country gentleman is conspicuous by his absence; that when he is brought face to face with local abuses of the gravest kind he is apparently unconcerned, and that in attempts at local reforms he lends no hand. There are of course notable exceptions; but, unless my experience be peculiar, they are few and far between.

No doubt there is something to be said in excuse for him. He has never been educated to any higher view of his position and work in life. He has not to win his property like other men by labour and self-denial; he only "comes in" to it, and therefore naturally believes that he has only to enjoy it. The good and great qualities which he often possesses are perhaps undeveloped because superfluous for a man whose occupation is that of owning land. His education is finished when he inherits his property. School days are over, now come the holidays; the country is his playground, and the duties which his position force upon him are but bothering interruptions to his enjoyment, which, like holiday tasks, he will shirk if he can. But the Nemesis which follows us all is not far behind the country gentleman. Duties may be avoided; penalties cannot. Already there are signs which seem to bode him no good, and awkward questions

are being asked about him, and awkward answers have to be returned. Is it too late for him to recover lost ground and regain that splendid position which he once held of being "the shepherd and leader of the people"? He looks back often with justifiable pride upon the history of the past, in which his ancestors bore an honourable, or at least no insignificant part. In every great crisis of his country's history; in the struggles which, from time to time, convulsed her and through which she reached her greatness; in her foreign wars, and in her civil strifes; in resisting the encroachments of the kingly power, or in maintaining the throne against the usurper, his forefathers were ever to the front. Their faults, like their virtues, were strongly marked; but they were *men*, and they were a power in the country. Does he never reflect what made them so? Partly, no doubt, the times. They were stirring times. The battle was to the strong and the race to the swift. But was there nothing in the fact that from their earliest days they had been trained by the rules of chivalry to discipline self, to take Christ for their captain, and to "do their devoir" to all men? Life now is smother, the warfare now of a different kind, but it is none the less real. Its rewards are less tangible, but they are more enduring, and it still needs men who are trained by self-discipline, who will take Christ for their captain, and who will do their devoir to all men. Will the country gentleman never again become a power in the country? Is he to disappear like the dodo and other extinct, because no longer useful, creatures? If so he will have only himself to thank for it. If he never regains the position he once held, it will be because he refused obedience to those divine laws of labour, duty, and self-denial which alone render such a position possible or deserved.

:

## II.—THE COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

A FEW months ago I read the following description of the agricultural labourer, from the pen of one who apparently wrote from experience:—"The rustics are not happy, they are sullen, averse to labour, they are ready for any form of rowdyism, they have no love but quite the reverse for those who are only anxious to serve them, they have lost all belief in kindness or disinterested motives, they disdain to submit to such restraints as religion has a tendency to impose. Physically and morally, a steady deterioration of the quality of our Arcadian swains has been going on." I am disposed to think that the writer's experience of the agricultural labourer had been somewhat unfortunate, and that one whose lines had fallen in pleasanter places, or who was perhaps of a more hopeful turn of mind, would probably give a very different account of him. Indeed, if his political friends are to be believed, there can be no question as to his material improvement, both in character and condition.



Mr. Giffen, too, in the paper he read before the Social Science Congress on "The Progress of the Working Classes in the Last Half Century," takes anything but a gloomy view of the case, and backs his opinion by some very remarkable statistics. The truth is, it is by no means an easy matter to arrive at a just conclusion. As an individual, the agricultural labourer is very hard to understand; while of all classes, his is perhaps the most difficult upon which to generalise. The circumstances which affect his condition—the rate of his wages, the way he is housed, the character of the land, as well as that of his landlord—vary within such extremely wide limits, that general conclusions are almost sure to be misleading. That there are some hopeful signs almost everywhere, no one would deny. His life is not quite such a drudgery as it used to be, though drudgery, alas! it is at best; he is in many ways more civilised; he fares better; his pleasures, few though they be, are of a less coarse nature; his field of view, narrow as it is, has been enlarged, and he now takes an interest in a world beyond the smoke of his own chimney. If he be more discontented, it is possibly only the sign and penalty of his having become less of an animal and more of a man. In some things it is to be wished he were more discontented still.

On the other hand, it is equally indisputable that together with these hopeful signs there is everywhere much that is sufficiently discouraging. I am afraid, too, it must be acknowledged that what is hopeful has been effected without, or even in spite of, the aid of his would-be friends, and that what is discouraging is largely due to their mistaken interference. And if so, it is not perhaps to be wondered at if he has ceased to believe in his friends. It is to be feared that there is only too much truth in the assertion. Most of us will have to acknowledge, if not the complete failure, at any rate the very imperfect success of our endeavours, especially of late years, to win his confidence; and, however disinterested our efforts on his behalf, he still views them with suspicion. The question now asked is, Can we account for his suspicion? Is it just or reasonable? Is it our misfortune or our fault? It may be conceded that if anxiety to serve another, and willingness to make sacrifices on his behalf, constitute a friend, then among all his so-called friends the agricultural labourer has none with a greater right to the name than the country clergyman. There is nothing he has so much at heart as the welfare of the labourer, nothing he covets more than the reputation of being the "poor man's friend," and for this end he is sometimes only too ready to make sacrifices. As in the case of the country gentleman so now with the country clergyman, my remarks will be strictly limited to the social, as distinct from the spiritual and religious, aspect of the question. If the country clergy had been content to confine their ministrations to the spiritual welfare of their flocks, they would have been less open to criticism. But they have been

ambitious, and rightly so, of a wider sphere, and a great part of their energies have been spent in direct attempts to better the outward conditions of the labourer's life. How far these attempts have been wise or successful is the question before us. It must be added that I am a country clergyman myself, and as such take my share of the criticisms which follow on a body of men to which I am proud to belong.

Let us take the case of an ordinary country parish, and let us consider the part which the clergyman plays in respect to the various agencies which surround, and directly or indirectly affect the moral and social well-being of the labourer. These, for the most part, exist with the avowed intention of benefiting those who are called "the poor," and it may be fairly said that for nearly all of them the clergyman is to a greater or less degree responsible. To him, as a rule, they owe their existence, and through his instrumentality they are maintained in working order. Among such must be reckoned the eleemosynary endowments of all kinds, the Christmas and other doles of bread and clothing and other necessities of life, the coal and clothing clubs, the offertory alms, and the charities emanating from the Hall. It is not too much to say that these are the fruits of his ministry, the outward visible signs of the Christianity he has preached. It was under the influence of his teaching, in days gone by, that the rich man who fared sumptuously every day was converted on his death-bed into a pious founder and left behind him lasting monuments of his piety in those village charities which afflict most country parishes. It is now mainly owing to his influence, and in answer to his appeals—and, let me add, by large sacrifices of his own time and money—that new charitable schemes are set on foot, and those already existing efficiently maintained. It is he who administers the endowed charities, organizes the clubs, distributes the offertory alms. If such things as these are really beneficial in their operation, the agricultural labourer has no better friend than the country clergyman. At any rate, it would seem impossible that the pains thus bestowed on his welfare, and the really large sums of money year by year spent on his behalf, should fail to have an effect in improving his condition or should leave him without a sense of gratitude to those who thus devote themselves to his interest. But what is the fact? Generation succeeds generation without any one being able to trace the least sign of real improvement arising out of such direct attempts to help him, and, so far from being grateful, an experienced writer assures us that "the labourers have no love for those who are anxious to serve them." Judging by results, the blindest admirer of such forms of benevolence must begin to suspect that their wisdom admits of a doubt.

As a matter of fact, the country clergyman himself does not believe in them, and will often confess as much. He may be, and generally

is, too timid to set his face against them, or he may make use of them, consciously or not, as a means of strengthening his own hands, or of acquiring, as he mistakenly supposes, a good name amongst his flock ; but, unless he has been exceptionally unobservant, he has long ago lost faith in them, as a means of really improving the condition of the poor. The astonishing thing is that his belief in them has lasted so long. It is, indeed, almost unnecessary nowadays to discuss the question as regards doles and eleemosynary charities. The intrinsic evil of such things is acknowledged even by the most inveterate "charity" lover, although it is seldom that he has the courage of his convictions. But the evil is only a little less apparent in almost every other scheme of direct benevolence which aims at supplying primary wants. The clothing and coal clubs, for example, which are generally regarded as essential to the efficient working of a country parish, are at best only the means whereby the poor are bribed to be provident, and unless entirely managed by themselves, as they ought to be, their inevitable tendency is to make the poor not more self-reliant, but less. Invidious distinctions have to be drawn provocative of jealousies and heart-burnings, those only being considered eligible who are called "the poor," while others, perhaps ten times more deserving, are left out in the cold, because their own exertions have raised them just above that favoured class. It is fair to say that such clubs had their place and value when first they were started and when possibly there was a necessity for something of the kind to induce an utterly thriftless class to make an attempt at providing for the future ; but even so, they should have been regarded as temporary expedients and as stepping-stones to something better. Nothing can be more certain than that so long as the poor are treated like children they will never learn to go alone. Then there is the offertory. As a rule it is at the sole disposal of the clergyman, and may be said to have almost all the evils of the dole system, together with some peculiar to itself. As usually distributed, it is impossible for it to be otherwise than a direct incentive to hypocrisy of the worst kind, to say nothing of envy, jealousy, and ill-will. As to the "charity" which emanates from the Hall—that doubtful good at all times, that unmitigated evil often—I pass it by because it may be thought unfair to make the parson responsible in these days, whatever he may have been in the past, for the doings or mis-doings of the Hall. Taking, then, into consideration merely these charitable agencies of a country parish for which the clergyman is responsible, and which exist avowedly with the intention of benefiting "the poor," we look in vain for results ; after centuries of trial we can point to no real service that they have done ; in so far as there has been any effect at all, it has been of a demoralising nature. This is humiliating enough, but it is even more humiliating to think that the country clergyman should fail to recognise it, or, worse still, should recognise it and persist as

he does in pursuing the same mistaken policy. Such methods of helping the poor appear to be still his only idea of charitable help. A parish is considered to be well worked in proportion as agencies of the kind flourish and abound. A clergyman's zeal and earnestness for the people's good are measured by his exertions in this direction. It is hardly to be wondered at if the shrewder among the labourers are beginning to distrust such mistaken friendship, and to receive with suspicion attempts like these to win his regard. But worse results than these are inevitable. The clergyman represents religion. He claims its name and sanction for what he does on behalf of the poor, and if his own character begins to be questioned, or if under a cloak of religion he is discovered or even suspected to be advancing his own popularity, or to be offering blessings which do not really bless, religion itself is brought into disrepute. And this is just what is said to be happening. Men are beginning, we are told, not merely to be suspicious of the parson, but to distrust the religion he represents. And indeed, if religion, or rather what is done in her name, does nothing for them, no wonder if they become indifferent to its claims, and disdain to submit to the restraints it has a tendency to impose.

Passing from agencies of this kind to those which appear to be of a less directly "charitable" nature, but which undoubtedly exert by far the most powerful influences on the character and condition of the labourer, it is very noticeable how little the country clergyman concerns himself about them. By what principle he is guided here, or by what process of reasoning he determines what is or is not within the sphere of his ministerial duties, it is very difficult to say. Why, for instance, should he concern himself about the labourers' coals, blankets, and clothing, and decline to interfere in the matter of his house, his water supply, his drains? Why should it be considered to belong to the sacred calling to distribute the parish doles and offertory alms, but not in any sense his duty to take an active part in social questions which materially affect the labourers' interests? In what is the office of a charity Trustee a more clerical one than that of a Guardian of the poor? It is intelligible that a clergyman should say that he intended to occupy himself exclusively with the spiritual concerns of his people, but it is past understanding that he should draw the line where he does; the strangest part of it all being that he limits his interference to those very things in which it is unnecessary and often mischievous, and refuses to stir a step in a direction where possibly his advice and experience might be of service.

The fact appears to be that the country clergyman is infected with the popular but radically mistaken conception that social improvement is to be won only or chiefly by direct schemes of benevolence, and that charitable help consists in supplying primary wants. Whereas nothing could be farther from the truth. Social improvement is not a manufacture but a growth and a product, and direct

schemes of benevolence, which are usually of an artificial and sentimental character, so far from promoting it, interfere in an arbitrary manner with those natural laws by which a sound and healthy progress is secured. Far beyond all the schemes of social reformers is the influence for good of legislative, scientific, or economic improvements. What, for instance, have all the charitable schemes ever devised by "the poor man's friends" done for him compared with what has been done by free trade or the spread of the principles of co-operation? The parson who establishes a co-operative store in a country village has done more for his parish than if he had spent all his living in "charity," so-called. Good and pleasant cottages at fair and not fictitiously low rents, are more "improving" and really helpful than miles of flannel and rivers of soup and wine. Poor Laws, Sanitary and Education Acts, properly administered, advance the interests of the poor a thousandfold more than the good intentions of pious founders, however piously carried out. There can be no manner of doubt that the better administration of poor-law relief in the union to which I belong, by means of which the proportion of paupers to population has been reduced from 1 in 12 to 1 in '60, has done more for the labourer in ten years' time than all the charities, coal clubs, and almsgiving which have flowed for centuries from the Halls and Rectories of every parish, within the district.

Let me not, however, be supposed to aim at stopping or even checking the kindly attention of the rich to their poorer friends. There is no need for it to be hurtful or degrading for the rich to give or the poor to receive, although too often it is both. There is nothing either hurtful or degrading connected with giving or receiving in the class above that of the labourer. A present of a hare and a brace of birds does not demoralise giver or receiver. Neither need the gifts which pass from the rich to the poor. The mistake and the mischief lie in the way they are regarded and bestowed, in looking on them as charities, and supposing they are really going to touch the question of doing good. We have yet, it would seem, to learn that as a general rule the proper sphere, perhaps the only safe sphere, of benevolence lies in providing opportunities—in endeavouring to secure men fair chances in life, in removing hindrances, in making virtue easy and vice difficult, in putting within their reach the means of obtaining light and knowledge and independence. For this, after all, is the Divine plan: God gives opportunities, but He does not interfere with natural laws in an arbitrary and haphazard way to save men from the consequences of their own neglect or folly. All who will may profit by His kindness, and prosper by the diligent use of the means He has provided, or take the consequence of abusing or neglecting them. Human philanthropy, on the other hand, trying to be more "charitable" than God Himself, adopts an exactly opposite course. It fails to provide, or, even worse, denies sometimes the opportunity,

and then tries to relieve the distress which selfishness or want of thought had caused. So it too often happens that the labourer is denied his fair chance in youth and manhood, must be content with a wretched home, low wages, few interests or opportunities for bettering his condition. Then when he is old and worn out we consider it "a charity" to give him "parish relief," a miserable pittance, compulsorily derived, not from our own but from other people's pockets.

But besides sharing and being in some measure responsible for these popular mistakes, it must be confessed that we country clergymen appear to have failings peculiarly our own, possibly developed by our profession, which largely depreciate the value of our ministrations. Among these, *Moral timidity* must be reckoned as perhaps the first. Our great aim, glory and criterion of success being a full church, we are haunted by the constant dread of offending our congregation. Probably we are not worse in this respect than our brother clergyman of the town, but our position is a much more difficult one. Plain speaking is comparatively easy to a congregation in which the various social grades are represented by hundreds, to what it is where they are represented by units. In this case home truths have the appearance of personalities, and are resented accordingly. However alive we may be to the shortcomings of the rich, to the harm they do by mistaken and self-indulgent charity, or to the good they might do by a little self-denial; or, however clearly we may perceive that the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table do not really help the beggar at his gate, it is by no means easy to warn or rebuke or point out the more excellent way, when there is but one rich man in our congregation, and perhaps we dined with him yesterday, or will dine with him to-morrow, and thus the warning or rebuke, if given at all, is given so vaguely that no one is the better for it. Especially, perhaps, is this the case in matters affecting the poorer members of the parish. We see only too painfully the mischief of the village charities. We hate the system, would give much to be rid of it, but dare not lay a finger on it because our popularity would be gone, we should cease to be regarded as the poor man's friend, and our church would be emptied.\* So with the clubs, we are afraid to abandon such time-honoured features of parish machinery, however much we may suspect their usefulness. So with the offertory alms, we are fearful of departing from the ordinary method of distribution by odd shillings and half-crowns, in order to substitute a more intelligent one by which our ministrations might be dissociated, as they ought to be, from almsgiving. Thus a mischievous system is perpetuated from generation to generation, each clergyman in turn being too timid to attack it.

Then, further, we are hampered by *Conventionality*. The first article of our creed is, "Whosoever will be saved above all things it is necessary that he keep the conventional faith." Conventional rules and standards guide or obscure our judgment upon all matters, sacred

or secular, and our habit of thought becomes as conventional as our attire. We adopt the conventional stand-point in the pulpit and on the platform with regard to the duties of the rich and the rights of the poor, and accept, without attempting a definition, the conventional phrases, "the poor," "the weak," and "the deserving." We submit without a protest to the conventional theory which condemns us to spend our energies in a round of small ministrations which any able-bodied old woman could discharge, but which forbids us to mix ourselves up in matters where possibly our superior education might be of service.

A third noticeable feature is what I must call, for want of a better word, our *Transcendentalism*. We are, so to speak, "up in a balloon," above our people's heads, and failing to perceive, except in a dim and distant way, the real interests of those below, who on their part regard us as belonging to another sphere, and are inclined to resent the necessity of looking up. Genuine friendship between us, as between man and man is felt to be impossible. An air of unreality seems to pervade the relations which exist between us. We are preaching about faith and feelings and the higher spiritual life, while too often they are absorbed in the question, "What shall I eat, what shall I drink, and wherewithal shall I be clothed?" The gospel we offer seems to them to have only the promise of the life to come. The gospel they want is one which will help them in the struggle for existence in the life that now is. We beautify our church and multiply our services, and are hurt that they don't seem to value either, forgetting that to many of them the idea of heaven itself is "a good fire, a pot of beer and a fiddle going."

A fourth peculiarity about us is our *Superstition*, or perhaps I should say, the superstitious character of our religion, by which I mean that on many points our religion is one which seems to shut its eyes to facts and its ears to the voice of reason and experience. It is this which has so often brought upon Christianity the reproach of being opposed to almost every reform, whether in medicine, science, or politics. The Bible, which is, and ought to be, our rule of faith in the matter of salvation, is interpreted often in a literal and mechanical way, and applied to almost every conceivable subject. We "go to the Bible," as the phrase is, very much as the American lad who was taught to "go to the Bible" for everything, and grew up thoroughly convinced that bigamy was the scriptural remedy for all existing social evils. With isolated texts or passages we dispose of the latest discovery of science, determine the age of the world, condemn the Deceased Wife Sisters Bill, settle the question of Church and State, and prove to demonstration the somewhat conflicting theories of the authority of the Church and the right of private judgment. Our superstition culminates in our relations with the poor. Here reason seems to

be abandoned, experience teaches nothing, political economy cries out in vain. With a mistaken reverence we cling to the "letter, which killeth." We seem to worship the book itself rather than the God who inspired it, and either discount its teaching to suit the general practice, or interpret it in a sense which every other voice of God flatly contradicts. And the natural tendency of this is to bring religion into contempt as an outrage upon reason and intelligence.

The last feature in the clerical character which needs to be noticed is *Ecclesiasticism*. Everything appears to be viewed with reference to the bearing it may have upon the Church (using the word in a limited and professional sense) rather than according to its intrinsic worth and usefulness. The Toryism which animates most country clergymen springs as a rule from the secret feeling that somehow or another, they cannot exactly say how, the interests of the Church are safer in the hands of the Tories than in those of the Liberals. It is this which is at the bottom of the unworthy fears which some of us have as to the extension of the franchise. This made many of us years ago view with suspicion the Education Act of 1870. This among other reasons (some of which are, no doubt, valid enough) makes us now so bitter against school boards. The first, the chief, almost the only consideration which appears to influence our opinion on any question of the day is, not how will it affect the people, or the general good, or religion itself, but how will it affect the Church?

In what has been written I have had in view country clergymen of the average type, men who are sincerely anxious, more so, perhaps, now than at any previous period of the Church history, to discharge the duties of their sacred calling, and who are particularly zealous in the cause of the poor. The contention of this article is that their zeal in this respect is not according to knowledge, and that partly owing to mistaken conceptions as to the way in which the poor should be helped, and partly owing to peculiarities, not to say defects, of a professional character, they have failed as a rule to win their confidence, and can scarcely be said to have deserved the name upon which most of all they pride themselves—"the friend of the poor."

There are, of course, exceptional cases above and below this average to whom the present article does not in the least apply. There are also other departments of clerical work with which it is not concerned, in which country clergymen maintain a high standard of devotion. Generally speaking, their zeal and earnestness and self-denying labours are far in advance of those of any other class of men. Even from the point of view of this article it may be pretty confidently asserted that they will compare favourably with the ministers of any other denomination. The defects which have been noticed in the country clergyman would probably be found to exist in an exaggerated form among the Nonconformist bodies. It would be surprising if it



were not so. Whatever its advantages in other respects, theirs is a system which inevitably fosters such defects, while the temptation, which is always great, to swim with the stream, and sacrifice truth to popularity, must become almost irresistible where a man's income depends upon it. But the question before us is not what are we, or what have we done compared with other Christian bodies, but what have we done at all to make good our claim to be the friends of the labourer, or to justify our position as the ministers of a church whose boast it is to be the church of the people, and whose mission, as we are never tired of saying, is to preach the gospel to the poor. After all these years what is the result? where are the fruits of our labour? Is it possible to be satisfied with them? Professedly the great aim of the Church of England is the welfare of the poor. In every village and hamlet throughout the country she places a man qualified, as she supposes, for the work: a man of approved character and attainments. Here he takes up his position, and, in the name of religion, organizes charities, and gives time and energy and money to the work, drawing others in to his assistance, and yet the practical result proves to be at best of a very negative character. The object of all this expenditure of energy and benevolence still appears to require, or at any rate still goes in leading-strings, still is unfit, so it is said, for the franchise, and if we cannot quite endorse the opinion, that he has physically and morally deteriorated, it is only too apparent that he still remains in nine cases out of ten a potential pauper.

Something wrong there evidently is somewhere. If we as clergymen cannot admit that the Church of England is incompetent for her own special mission, or that the religion of Christ fails where it is needed most, we are bound to find some other alternative. Perhaps the reproach of failure may lie with ourselves. Our ideas of the Church's work, and the methods by which it should be carried out, possibly need revising. Our notions of charity and how to help the poor are perhaps obsolete, founded on what was "said by them of old times," and needing to be corrected by the "I say unto you" of a divine teacher, who is always with us, who did not give us stereotyped precepts eighteen hundred years ago, but ever-living principles, which by His spirit He teaches how to apply in the changed and changing conditions of the society of to-day. But wherever the defect or cause of failure may be, it is for each of us to endeavour to discover it, and have the courage to own it, and the strength of mind, as far as lies in our power, to correct it.

## ENGLAND'S PLACE IN INDIA.

### I.—AN INDIAN THERSITES.

AFTER having laboured with much ingenuity and success to kindle the flame of rebellion in Egypt, whither unsympathetic English officials have refused to allow his return, Mr. Wilfrid Blunt surveyed the world with the object of discovering that spot where his natural genius for intrigue might do the most harm to his country. This he discovered in India, and the results of his five months of travel therein have been given to the English public in a succession of articles in this Review under the headings "The Agricultural Danger," "Race Hatred," and "The Muhammadan Question." I cannot but believe that when this apostle of Pan-Islamism again turns his face eastwards he will find that the Indian Government, tolerant though they be of the preaching of sedition, will longingly regard those drastic measures of political quarantine which have banished Mr. Blunt from Egypt, and will wish that they could be as effectively applied at Bombay and Calcutta. But of this there is little hope. India is the prey of every charlatan and theorist; on her torn body every experimentalist tries his prentice hand, and the applause of foolish persons who mistake ignorant sentiment for educated sympathy incites the crowd of irresponsible chatterers to fresh efforts. And yet Indian interests are far larger and more important to Englishmen than those of Egypt. The encouragement of seditious intrigue and the abuse of officials who are honestly striving to do their duty must be more directly injurious in India than in Egypt, and there is no reason that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt should, in one country be welcomed as an apostle of progress, and in the other be expelled as a pestilent nuisance. I do not propose to follow Mr. Blunt step by step through his Indian wanderings in search of the romantic; while to expose the errors into which he has fallen would take both more space than this Review could spare, and more time than belongs to an official who is as actively engaged in the service of his country as is Mr. Blunt in its vilification. My intention is no more than to prove to educated and impartial Englishmen that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt on Indian affairs is a blind guide, and that by temper, habit of thought, and method of inquiry he is singularly incompetent to form a reasonable opinion upon Indian phenomena. In attempting this I shall naturally illustrate my protest against the spirit and manner of his criticism by some of the more amusing of his errors, which are such as those which Nemesis invariably spreads as a snare for the feet of dogmatism.

With an ingenuous attempt to disarm hostile criticism, Mr. Wilfrid

Blunt, whose self-complacency is really proof against any suspicion of his own fallibility, introduces his "Ideas about India" with several introductory pages to demonstrate why he should be accepted as an authority on the subjects he discusses. I am quite ready to admit that an intelligent traveller, "with an open and sympathetic mind," may in six months obtain a large and useful knowledge of any country, the language and customs and modes of thought of which were already familiar to him. But in no country is a tourist so likely to be at fault as India, which is a continent inhabited by races of the most opposite characteristics, speaking many different languages, with no one of which was Mr. Wilfrid Blunt acquainted. Even the superficial appearance of homogeneity among Hindus disappears on examination, and the various subdivisions of the Brahmanical creed are far more opposed in sentiment and practice than are Christians of the Roman, Greek, or Protestant Churches. Many of us, like Mr. Blunt, have been quite certain that we had mastered intricate Indian questions, after a few months in the country, though few perhaps have ventured to assert their self-appreciation so loudly and publicly. But the longer our acquaintance with the people; the more intimately we penetrate into the inner social life of palace and village; the more we estimate the strength of those slow, silent currents which stir the outwardly tranquil Indian mind, the more we distrust our scanty knowledge and leave the assertion of infallibility, delivered *orbi et urbi*, to "sympathetic" tourists who have brought in their portmanteaus a panacea for every Indian disorder. It may, indeed, be doubted whether information of much value can be extracted from the Indians through an interpreter. Intimate and fluent knowledge of their vernacular is the only key that unlocks their heart and tongue. Without this they withhold their confidence.

But of little advantage is the gift of tongues to him who poisons the very source of knowledge by the determination to see and hear nothing but that which suits his political purpose. The action of Mr. Blunt in Egypt is before the world, which has judged it and him. The champion of a rebel whom the generous contempt of the British Government alone saved from the scaffold which he richly deserved; the persistent opponent of every scheme of reform proposed by his countrymen, the conduct of our critic in India was in exact accord with his Egyptian antecedents. Restless vanity, embittered by failure, prompted him, in India as in Egypt, to see an enemy and a tyrant in every official of the Government which had ventured to tell him that they could arrange their foreign policy without his assistance, and led him to seek information from those alone among whom discontent and disloyalty are notoriously common—the Mahomedans of Patna and Hyderabad, and those political Associations, the objects and

principles of which, if not seditious, are still inconsistent with the conditions on which our Indian Empire can alone securely rest. Although I was in England when Mr. Blunt was in India, I followed his wanderings with special interest, and could give a fairly accurate account of his doings and the character of his associates. His visit to Hyderabad may serve as a fair sample of the tour. Here Mr. Blunt was to have been the guest of Mr. Seymour Keay, well known for his mischievous and foolish abuse of the Government, and who was then said to be actively fomenting intrigue against the authority of the Nizam and the British Resident. The last-named official, however, offered his hospitality to Mr. Blunt, who accepted it, and might have had an excellent opportunity of informing himself of the real state of Hyderabad politics had he chosen to do so. But this was not his purpose. He avoided all those native officials of the Nizam's Government, who were trusted by its responsible head, the Peshkár or Senior Administrator, and associated only with his enemies. To this small body of men, clever and well educated, although in no way representing Hyderabad ideas and traditions, he was introduced by Mr. Keay as the protector of outraged Moslem virtue in Egypt against the violence of England, and was naturally received with open arms. When the account of the Hyderabad visit is published by Mr. Blunt with the hope of making all administration there impossible, it will be seen that the sources of his information are such as I describe.

Before leaving the subject of Hyderabad, I will mention another incident to show the method of investigation favoured by our critic. A few days before he sailed from Bombay, he met at one of the large horse marts a native officer of rank belonging to one of the regiments of the Hyderabad Contingent. With this gentleman he entered into conversation, and asked him whether the men of the Contingent were loyal, and whether they were not dissatisfied with their officers. The astonished Risaldar assured him that the officers were not unpopular; when the defender of Arabi rejoined, "Don't be afraid to tell me the exact truth. I am not one of the Sahibs (English gentlemen), and do not belong to them." Without examining too closely the good taste or patriotism of such inquiries—and patriotism Mr. Blunt would indignantly disclaim—those who know the habit of the Hindu mind will understand that leading questions, judiciously asked, will extract any replies that may be required. In India, the curse of servitude and tyranny has left its brand on the national character; and submission to authority and desire to please any person who, like an Englishman, appears clothed with power, are universal. What Mr. Blunt desired to hear, that he would undoubtedly be told. Nor was this all; but, proclaiming himself in opposition to the Government and denouncing his own countrymen as tyrants; choosing the

society of the disaffected and rejecting that of the loyal, he made it impossible for him to hear the truth even had he so wished.

The first of Mr. Blunt's articles deals with what he terms "The Agricultural Danger;" and its cornucopia of paradoxes and misconceptions may be emptied in a few sentences. The agricultural danger consists in that "the Government of India, as landlord, does practically nothing for the land. All is squandered and spent on other things, and the people who till the soil are yearly becoming poorer and more hopeless." The aspects of poverty are startling. "Entering a Deccan village one is confronted with peasants nearly naked, and if one asks for the head man one finds him no better clothed than the rest." The huts are bare of furniture. The peasants, on being questioned, admit that they do not eat meat, and rice but rarely. This extraordinary and lamentable state of things the tourist is, of course, prepared at once to remedy by sweeping away the Salt Tax and the Forest Laws, and restoring the ancient and wholesome system of grain for cash payment of the Government demand. Protective duties must be reimposed to encourage local manufactures, and the extravagant costliness of the civil and military establishments must be largely reduced. These radical measures being adopted and an Income Tax imposed, prosperity may again, in Mr. Wilfrid Blunt's opinion, return to this distressful, official-ridden country.

It is somewhat difficult to criticize an argument which, in sweet reasonableness, resembles *Alice in Wonderland*; but I may remark that to select a Deccan village as a type of the results of English administration, and as a fair specimen of the normal life and surroundings of the Indian peasant, is the same as selecting a Connemara village as representative of English agriculture. As to the dress of the Deccan peasant, we may remember that Miss Carpenter, on her first visit to India, was similarly surprised and shocked at seeing the little boys and girls running about naked; but it may be suggested that not poverty but a tropical climate allows the Deccan peasant to prefer a scanty wardrobe to the garments of Skinner or Hill. With equal surprise did Sterne, in his *Sentimental Journey*, hear the children at Calais talking fluently in French. If our tourist had visited a Punjab village in the cold season, he would have noticed that the majority of the people were well and sufficiently clothed. There is, unfortunately, in India, as elsewhere, a large residuum of extreme poverty, with which insufficient clothing is the rule, but even of these the climate makes their case far less trying than it would be in colder countries. As to the Deccan labourer not eating meat, I would ask what peasant in the world does eat meat. In the Suffolk village where I lived, the labourers certainly did not taste meat more than three or four times a year: the Italian peasant thinks himself fortunate if he can obtain a sufficiency of bread and

garlic: the Russian peasant never eats meat, nor does the French. Why, then should Mr. Blunt hold up the Deccan agriculturist as exceptionally miserable because he does not eat flesh in a tropical climate where such food is neither needed nor desired, and where its use is discouraged by religious precept? If his obtaining rice but rarely be considered a further grievance, I would tell our tourist that rice is not the customary food of the people of India, any more than it is in England. In North and Central India rice is used merely as an occasional luxury, supplemental to the ordinary food staples of wheat, millet, and Indian-corn, while only in Madras and Lower Bengal is it a common food. But although Mr. Blunt's signs of poverty are fallacious, I am not prepared to deny that there is much destitution and distress in Deccan villages. The goodness or badness of a Government makes but little difference in the happiness or misery of a people inhabiting a famine-stricken tract, where irrigation is difficult, the soil poor, and the rainfall uncertain. To judge fairly of the effects of the English-rule we should turn to a province like the Punjab, and compare its condition to-day with that at the time of its annexation, thirty-five years ago. The population may truly be said to have doubled, and the cultivated area has certainly increased in as great a ratio as the population. The country, which was almost treeless, is becoming well wooded; the wages of labour have everywhere risen: canals have immensely increased both the production and the security of the crops; while railways and roads have allowed the export of the surplus grain and have largely added to the wealth of the province. The improvement is visible on every side, in the towns as in the villages, in the dress of the people, in their dwellings, in the ornaments of the women, in the general air of prosperity and content. A tourist who starts from the premiss that the people of India are poor—which no one denies—and concludes that this poverty is due to the action of the Government whose most constant anxiety is to improve the condition of the people, is neither honest nor wise. Poverty is comparative; and we should inquire whether the condition of the people has grown better or worse under English rule: if their poverty is less widespread and extreme than under native rulers; if wages have risen or fallen; if new markets have been opened; if the savings of the community are more secure.

There was probably no period during which the condition of India was so miserable as in the one hundred years which preceded the extension of the authority of the British Government over the Continent. The old Mogal dynasty was dying of sheer decrepitude; and, in every province, adventurers, little better than robber chiefs, were striving to seize power and lands for themselves. Central India and Rajputana were ravaged by the Mahratta and Pindari hordes, who left the miserable people nothing but their lives; while

the state of North India before the rise of Ranjit Singh may be clearly seen in my histories of the Chiefs and Rajas of the Punjab. Ruin, desolation, and despair were the lot of India, whose most fertile provinces were reduced to a desert. The cultivator, if he dared to sow the crop which he would probably never reap, worked armed with sword and spear. The lives of men and the honour of women were nowhere safe; and the darkest days of the Middle Ages in Europe were reproduced in Hindustan. From this, English rule saved India; and from that day to this, through good report and evil report, despising equally the praise of flatterers and the blame of fools, the Government has laboured for the good of the country which the valour and genius of its servants had so hardly won. And, to-day, a discredited employé of the Foreign Office, who desires to avenge himself upon a Government which has treated him with the indifference he deserves, is not ashamed to tell his countrymen that "the Government of India, as landlord, does practically nothing for the land. All is squandered and spent on other things, and the people who till the soil are yearly becoming poorer and more hopeless." Seeing that the Government does not itself cultivate the soil, while it has ordinarily surrendered its proprietary rights in the land to the people, it is difficult to understand what more it could do than it has done. Everything that a wise landlord would attempt, it has attempted, with fewer mistakes and more economically, year by year. The whole of the surplus revenues of India are spent upon public works directly improving the land, increasing its productiveness and allowing its wealth to be distributed to the best advantage. The country is covered with a network of roads and railways; while transit duties, restricting trade, have been abolished everywhere except in Native States. Many millions have been spent on the most elaborate systems of irrigation, which have absolutely protected large tracts from famine; and Local Administrations, in the several provinces, compete with the Central Government in carrying out well-considered works of public advantage.

When it is asserted that "all is squandered on other things," Mr. Blunt implies that the army and civil administration are very costly. Indeed, elsewhere he writes, "It is impossible for me in the limits of this paper to argue out the question of the excessive costliness of the civil and military establishments of India. These are notorious in the world as surpassing those of all other countries to which they can fairly be compared in the present time or the past. And although they may also lay claim to be the most efficient, it does not prevent them from being a vast financial failure." What is the real truth concealed beneath this exaggeration of language? Precisely the reverse of the statement made. When the condition of the Indian Empire be considered: the vast extent of the territory; the number

and heterogeneity of the population; the character of the frontier line of defence and the multiplicity of Native States maintaining armies of their own, it will be admitted that the civil and military establishments are both exceedingly small and extraordinarily cheap. It is true that India, like England, has to pay a certain price for freedom; and that voluntary service is proportionately far more expensive than forced conscription, such as India would have experienced had fortune given her into the hands of France or Russia. But only Mr. Blunt would make a grievance of what is her greatest blessing. Nor is there any hope to hold out to sentimental economists that the cost of either army or Civil Service will be reduced. On the contrary, I believe that a large and permanent increase of the army estimates is imminent. The position which Russia has taken up on the frontiers of Afghanistan renders necessary a reconsideration of the strength of the Indian garrison, and the organization of a scheme, which must be costly, for a sufficient military reserve. But Mr. Blunt, who asserts that the people are yearly becoming poorer and more hopeless, will perhaps be surprised to hear that the largest and most certain increase of military expenditure will be caused by the fact that the agricultural class is becoming so prosperous, while wages have everywhere risen so much, that they will not take service in the army, under present circumstances.

The army as a profession is still highly popular, and is indeed especially congenial to the temper of the races of Northern India, while no temporary cause of unpopularity exists such as the Afghan war, when recruiting ceased and high bounties failed to tempt suitable men. Yet the fact remains that while, twenty, or thirty, or fifty years ago, an unlimited number of recruits could be had for the asking and every regiment had numerous candidates on its lists, commanding officers now find great difficulty in filling the ordinary vacancies. There is only one explanation, and it confutes the misrepresentations of pessimist critics. I have frequently discussed it with native officers in Sikh or Mahomedan villages where we were accustomed to draw our best recruits. The story is everywhere the same. The general prosperity of the country is such that military pay, which was once above, has fallen far below the market rate of wages: and, secondly, that whereas, in old days, the family holding was insufficient to maintain the adult males, who were thus forced to enter the army or emigrate, the agricultural position is now so greatly improved, by rapid communication, the rise of prices, and the opening of distant markets, that the young Sikh finds it more profitable to assist in cultivating his father's fields than to take to soldiering for which he has a natural liking and an inherited aptitude. The Government are well aware of the state of the case, but naturally are trying to avoid the great expense of raising generally



the pay of the native army. However, the measure is inevitable; and it is distinctly unwise to defer it to times of danger or anxiety when its significance would be misunderstood.

The cost of the Civil Administration ever tends to increase with the growing demands of a higher and more complex civilisation. Whether the number of English Civilians can be reduced is doubtful. Cheapness is not everything; and too often means extravagance and waste. The highly trained English officer may be replaced by a Bengali Baboo, with his mouth as full of platitudes as his hands are of bribes; but if foolish people think that the administration would be improved thereby or the people of India satisfied, they are mistaken. We hold India for the reason that the people have accepted, with joy, the honest, equitable, and benevolent personal rule of Englishmen in place of the grinding tyranny and rapacity of their own countrymen. They do not desire the restoration of Mr. Blunt's Mahomedan friends or of the Baboo, of whom in these days we hear a great deal too much; and any attempt to instal either the one or the other in power would be seriously resented. The emoluments of the Indian Civil Service have been affected as seriously by the general prosperity of the country as has military pay; and the question of the improvement in the position of Civilians will require early consideration. The prospect has so completely changed since Mr. George Trevelyan, in the charming book which was so brilliant an introduction to his distinguished literary career, first described the joys and sorrows of "a Competition-wala," that his account of the assured and comfortable position of the fortunate Civilian reads like satire. In the last twenty years, the rates of salary have fallen below what men who have been successful in the Indian competition might fairly expect to obtain in professional life in England, and it is now difficult for them to save anything for their old age or for the education of their children in addition to the paltry pension, of some £400 a year, which is granted them by the State. Unless the position of the Civil Service be materially improved, a serious falling off in the intellectual quality of the candidates for appointment will soon be observed. Mr. Blunt has indeed found extravagance and luxury in Anglo-Indian homes; and as a proof thereof writes, "No Collector's wife will wear an article of Indian manufacture to save her soul from perdition, and all her furniture, even to her carpets, must be of English make." The reply to this poor sarcasm is that Indian fabrics and Indian or Persian carpets are among the most expensive of manufactured articles; and that it is poverty and not the pride of wealth which prevents English ladies in India indulging in the delights of Chanderi or Dacca muslins, the embroidery of Delhi or the shawls of Kashmir.

In his attempt to degrade the Indian Administration, Mr. Blunt was not likely to omit the foolish stories, long ago refuted by statistics,

of the lower social status of the Civilians appointed by competition as compared with the servants of the Company; but this point is not worth serious discussion. If true, it would be unimportant, for the idea that the natives understand or care for those small *nuances* of manner which constitute good breeding, is erroneous. The old Civil Servants were a body of gentlemen entitled to all respect. But Haileybury had no aristocratic pretensions, and although it is true that a few cadets of needy and noble Scotch houses were given nominations, I have never heard that they were distinguished for public virtue or capacity. The composition of the service to-day is the same as of old: that is to say, the sons of professional men, officers of the navy and army, of clergymen, lawyers, doctors, and country gentlemen. That there are a few sons of tradesmen in the Civil Service, I admit; but, it is surely somewhat late in the nineteenth century, servile as its traditions may be, for even Mr. Blunt to despise men who have risen by their own honourable exertions from the unfavourable surroundings of their birth. Better far a family thus founded than some noble houses of England who have picked their honours out of the gutter; whose wealth is public robbery, the reward of infamy or the price of the favours of some royal courtesan. So far from the few Civilians of humble origin being less popular with the natives, as Mr. Blunt pretends, my experience as Chief Secretary to a Government having necessary and intimate knowledge of the character and reputation of every Civilian in the province, is to an exactly contrary effect. They were among the most zealous and devoted workers; and, as might be imagined, exceedingly liked by the people, with whom they were in full sympathy.

The remedy which Mr. Blunt suggests for the estrangement which he wrongly imagines to exist between the officials and the people, is that the Civilians should return to the ancient ways; live the life of the people; take the daughters of Heth as mistresses, and follow the same routine of extravagance, dissipation, and corruption which once gave Anglo-Indian administrators so unwholesome a reputation. This is what our critic, speaking of the old Civilian, and adopting, as his own, the statements of his native friends, has the assurance to assert. "He did not disdain to make friends with those of the better class, and occasionally he married among them, or at least contracted semi-matrimonial relations with the women of the land. This may have had its ill-consequences in other ways, but it broke down the hedge of caste prejudice between East and West and gave the official a personal interest in the people *which no mere sense of duty, however elevated, could supply*." But fortunately for India and Englishmen, these heroic remedies are no longer possible; the old order changes to return no more; nor does even Mr. Blunt insist on a revival of

these patriarchal traditions. He is indeed preparing for the press a plan of ultimate self-government for India, which we may await with the certain confidence that it will be strictly designed on the principle of destroying the power and influence of his country in the East.

If it were really true that India is becoming poorer and more embarrassed instead of richer and more powerful, the outlook would be gloomy indeed; seeing that the military and civil expenditure must continually increase. But fortunately the prosperity of the country is such that the revenue grows, naturally, as quickly as the charges upon it, and will probably have doubled in the next fifty years. The Indian people are comparatively poor; but the population is so vast that a slight increase of general taxation brings in a large return. Nor should the poverty of the Indian peasant be unduly exaggerated, as is commonly done by interested agitators. He lives in a climate which necessitates neither expensive clothing nor a meat diet. He is simple in his tastes and amusements; and his gentle, inoffensive, and religious life, although one of constant labour, is not unhappy. He is devoted to his family: he forms one of a village community whose fortunes are identical with his own, and which surrounds his life with a large circle of sympathetic interests. He is probably deep in debt to the village money lender: but this circumstance does not affect his spirits more than it does those of my many London friends who are in precisely the same condition. An impartial observer who examines the life and surroundings, the moral and mental acquirements and capacity of the peasantry in other countries, will probably allow that the Hindu cultivator is a much happier man, with a far more agreeable life and higher in the scale of humanity; more instructed by nature, more virtuous, sympathetic and friendly, than the Italian, Russian, or English peasant. No one can know the Indian peasantry, and I am specially thinking of the Punjab, without feeling a strong affection for them. They seem to me to possess most virtues and singularly few defects—brave, simple, hospitable, patient, good-tempered and affectionate; they are a noble race, who deserve a better fate than to be *exploité* by Mr. Wilfrid Blunt in search of a grievance.

If you look for deep poverty, which only lives and suffers: where the bare requirements of living are all that the cultivator can call his own, you can easily find it in India as elsewhere: and nowhere more easily than in a Deccan village which, with conspicuous bad faith, has been selected as typical of Indian agriculture. But in most parts of India the cultivator is far removed from the line which separates comfort from starvation. In Native States, as last year, I showed in some detail,<sup>1</sup> he ordinarily pays double the taxation which is imposed in British territory, while he gets nothing in return; for the Raja,

(1) "Indian Princes at Home."—Fortnightly Review. 1883.

who treats the whole revenue as his private property, spends nothing on the people, whom he has not been educated to think of more account than cattle. Yet the peasant bears this double burthen without much apparent difficulty. I should like to think that there was a great difference between our lightly taxed cultivators and the more heavily burthened subjects of the independent chiefs: but I cannot honestly say that I see much difference. I remember once, being in charge of a Native State, that two districts which had been temporarily under British rule and had reverted to the chief, had been assessed by English officers at about half the land revenue claimed elsewhere in the State. Yet these districts which should have been the most prosperous were the most impoverished, and their inhabitants the most improvident. The system of collection and administration was identical in the two tracts. The only difference was that, in the one, the people were not compelled to be industrious by outside pressure. The elasticity of the Hindu peasant is remarkable; and this is no reason that he should be unduly burthened. But the English system often errs on the side of too liberal assessments which demoralize the people: and while there are tracts, like the Deccan, where taxation cannot be wisely enhanced, there are many parts of North India where the agricultural wealth has been directly created by the irrigation expenditure of the Government, and where the cultivators might pay double the amount of revenue they now contribute, without having any just cause of complaint. The tendency of the Administration, strengthened by ignorant criticism such as Mr. Blunt's, is to weakly surrender the rights of the Government to interested clamour and to pitch the land revenue assessments too low rather than too high.

That the Indian peasant is deeply in debt to the money-lender is generally true, and Mr. Blunt may make as much of the fact as he can. But its real significance is not what he imagines. The peasant is in debt because the Government, with perhaps too facile a generosity, has made him the proprietor of his lands, a freeholder and a free man, with power to sell and mortgage. The land of England is owned by some 30,000 persons, and the labourer who tills it has no more share in it than the sheep he tends. But on the Hindu peasant the Government has conferred those rights and privileges of citizenship which are denied to Englishmen. If the divine gift has been misapplied, this is due to the habits begotten of servitude, which have taught the Hindus improvidence. Not that they are an extravagant race; on the contrary, I have already referred to their frugal and simple lives: but, before the English rule, if a man were known to be possessed of any wealth, he was at once robbed of it by the first comer stronger than himself.

The inevitable result was the national habit of at once spending

every new acquisition before it could be seized by some one else. Hence the origin of the cultivators' debts. In Native States, where he has nothing to sell and no rights in the land, he is not in debt, for the simple reason that he can find no one so foolish as to lend him money without security. The evil—and it is a serious evil—will right itself in time. But the remedy, worse than the disease, suggested by Mr. Blunt, is to revert to the ancient custom of collecting the revenue in grain instead of cash. In former days, when the money in circulation was small in amount, and barter and exchange took the place of sale, the revenue was collected in kind, either by an appraisement of the standing crop or by a division of the gathered grain. Perhaps no system has been ever invented by which industry was so much placed under the heel of tyranny. Under the pretence of regulating the demand according to the character of the season, it was always an uncertain amount, though it was certain to be unfavourable to the cultivator. Sometimes the landlord or the Government took half the crop, sometimes thirty, forty, or sixty per cent. of the gross out-turn. As there was no limit to the primary demand, so were the opportunities for extortion numberless. Every official had to be bribed, and unless the *douceur* were sufficiently high, the wretched peasant was doomed to see the crop, which he did not dare to touch before the formal division, left rotting in the field or spoiling on the threshing-floors. Those who would understand the Oriental system of land revenue, its sham benevolence, its grasping tyranny, its meanness, and the ruin it brings upon the people, should study with care the account given in the 47th chapter of Genesis of the proceedings of Joseph, the astute Minister of Pharaoh, during the famine. He was neither better nor worse than the ordinary Eastern tyrant. Of the many benefits which England has conferred on India, the substitution of cash for grain payments is the most undoubted, and it has relieved the people of an intolerable burthen. An attempt to revert to grain payments would cause, and justly cause, a revolution. But such considerations are doubtless below the standard of Laputa philosophy favoured by Mr. Blunt. Our land revenue system is too rigid, and might with advantage be rendered more elastic; but it weighs so lightly on the people that the cause of their indebtedness is, as I have shown, to be found elsewhere.

I do not think that it would be profitable to follow Mr. Blunt in his sincere and successful search after the false in Indian political economy. Nothing in these "Ideas" is new except the facts, which are wrong, as "it is certain that no ryot in all India wears any clothing of foreign make," when, if our critic had used his eyes, he would have found Manchester cloth in every village, and the brilliant colours and tasteless patterns of Manchester on the petticoat of every second peasant woman he met. The statement that the cultivator was accustomed to employ his spare time in manufacturing articles

for local consumption—a resource of which the British connection has deprived him—is entirely fanciful, and is not only unsupported by facts, but is opposed to the traditional custom of the country. Railways, we are told, have destroyed the carrying trade—and of course this is true with reference to the main lines of commerce—but the world cannot stand still to please Mr. Blunt. No triumph of convenience and public utility can take place without injury to some interest; and the people of India, who delight in railway travelling, are not likely to abandon it because Mr. Wilfrid Blunt prefers to ride in a stage coach in company with a dodo.

The usual abuse of the Salt Tax does not call for further notice than that this particular tax is one with which Indian financiers would willingly dispense were they able to do so. Of this there is no immediate hope. Meanwhile it should be remembered that (the land revenue not being of the nature of a tax at all, and merely representing the indefeasible rights of the Government) the salt duty is the only taxation, direct or indirect, that falls upon the Indian peasant. If he be content to drink no spirits, he may pass through life without having paid a single rupee to the imperial revenue, beyond the trifling addition which taxation adds to the price of his salt. I defy the pessimist critics to disprove this statement. The Indian peasant is, not only absolutely, but comparatively, and with the fullest consideration of his capacity and surroundings, the most lightly taxed of human beings, and the foundation of the power of the British Government of India, as its best title to fame, lies in this, that, being strong, it respected the weak, and that it has taken so little when, without rebuke, it might have taken so much.

It is impossible to conclude this paper without some reference to Mr. Blunt's article on "Race Hatred," although I will dwell as briefly as I can on a subject which is eminently distasteful to me, as it must be to every Englishman. But in justice both to the natives of India as to Mr. Blunt's own countrymen whom he has alike libelled, it is necessary to enter a strong protest against the mischievous statements which he has not been ashamed to give to the world. "Race hatred" is a phrase of evil suggestiveness, and if it expresses what does not exist on the part of either English or Hindus, no condemnation can be too strong for those who wilfully aggravate and embitter differences which have their origin in the nature of the connection between England and India, and contain no elements of race-feeling. That there is a large, influential, and educated class who devote themselves to political intrigue, whose hostility to the Government is permanent, and whose seditious efforts are only restrained by fear, is manifest. They are noisy and virulent enough, both in England and India. But the mischief that they attempt and the ill-feeling which they create and stimulate, will be viewed with less indignation by Englishmen than the unpatriotic delight with

which Mr. Blunt seizes every opportunity of defaming his countrymen in India, and ascribing to them every selfish and unworthy motive. His article on "Race Hatred" has been condemned by all loyal native gentlemen, as it has been applauded by the class who naturally welcome any new and valuable contribution to the literature of treason.

There is no such thing as "race hatred" on the part of Englishmen towards Indians, and it is an insult to civilisation to be compelled to disclaim it. That all Europeans treat Indians with the politeness which is inculcated in Lord Chesterfield's letters I do not assert. The Anglo-Saxons are a rough, imperious people, as all the world knows, without much superficial polish. But they are generous, and not unkindly. The very gentleness and helplessness of the Hindu, which, in a noble mind, awaken kindness and sympathy, are apt, in some lower natures, to breed contempt and cruelty. But when the whole question is fairly regarded, it will be admitted that the attitude of ordinary Englishmen to natives is kindly enough. If there be little sympathy between the races and no affection, there is still neither dislike nor hatred. Mr. Wilfrid Blunt has related an incident of which he was witness, in which a Punjab doctor insulted grievously certain native gentlemen at the Patna railway station. The conduct of this officer, if correctly reported, which I doubt, was disgraceful; but the animus of Mr. Blunt is shown in making it a text for his sermon on race hatred. The incident was altogether exceptional. I have never seen an English officer treat native gentlemen in this insulting fashion, and the general character of official Englishmen is not to be gauged by the conduct of one ill-bred or tipsy doctor. It must not be supposed that Indians are as sensitive to impoliteness as Englishmen would be. The whole atmosphere of the East is charged with insult and oppression. In Egypt, Persia, Turkey, and in the Native States of India the same phenomena are to be observed. Every official, from the minister or pasha down to the lowest hireling who draws his pay from the State, is a tyrant who abuses his power habitually, within the limits, large or small, to which his mischief is confined. This statement is no exaggeration, but a fact to which all who know the East can testify. The people are accustomed to be trampled upon, and insult and contempt have been their habitual portion from officials of their own race. Nor can the Government uproot these traditions of tyranny from the practice of its own native subordinates. Our most difficult work in India is to prevent native officers abusing the power with which we are compelled to entrust them. In London, a month ago, I was walking down Regent Street with a Persian gentleman of great intelligence, who had been attached to my staff in Afghanistan, and who has since resided in India. I asked him what, in London, struck him as the most remarkable thing. After consideration he replied, that what

seemed to him most wonderful was the politeness of the police, who were never weary of assisting or directing a stranger; while in India, if a native asked a constable a question, he would receive only abuse for his pains. This curious reply is worthy of consideration. Why should so high a standard of politeness be expected from the Englishman in India, when we cannot compel our gentle native officers to act with common decency towards their fellow-countrymen? The whole accusation is trivial, and is only advanced in mere default of graver charges. If official Englishmen treat the natives with that justice and consideration which they never before experienced, they may well be indifferent, as they are indifferent, to the occasional rudeness of their less polished English fellow-subjects.

We have heard much in these days of Indian dangers, and the minds of many in England are disturbed when they think of what the future may conceal. But there are no dangers which may not be met and overcome by the same courage and endurance and confident spirit which have established this world-wide empire, which rescued India from anarchy, and placed it as the brightest jewel in the crown of our gracious Queen. England is strong to hold her possessions against a world in arms; and should the day of trial come, her enemies will find that her sons are no unworthy descendants of those who, in old days, in every land and on every sea, upheld the honour of the national flag. The danger to British power in India is not from without but from within. It consists in the license allowed to sedition, in the interested efforts of demagogues to stir up ill-feeling against the Government, and persuade the people that they are oppressed and impoverished by the only rulers who have striven honestly to do their duty. The people of India have no dislike to Englishmen, and no feeling of hostility to the Government, which, indeed, they neither know nor understand. They watch its strange and resistless action with the eyes of a child who, through the summer day on the shore, sees the ocean rise and fall, sweeping away his sand-castles, and bringing back mysterious treasures of sea-weed and shells from the unknown depth. But in their simplicity lies the danger, which is ever the curse of ignorance, that they are the easy prey of adventurers and demagogues, who can persuade them to believe falsehoods, however transparent, and teach them to see grievances where they have really only cause for satisfaction and gratitude. It is into the hands of such men that Mr. Blunt plays; he disheartens the loyal and encourages the traitor; and if my protest against the mischievous tendency of his writings should appear too warmly framed, and if I have refused to his expressed convictions the negative merit of honesty, it is that his career, both in Egypt and India, has convinced me that his mission in life is less the championship of the oppressed than the humiliation of his country.

LEPEL GRIFFIN.



## II.—IDEAS ABOUT INDIA.

## V.—THE FUTURE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

UNLESS I have wholly failed to make my reasoning clear, readers of these essays will by this time have understood that, in answer to the question propounded at the outset of this inquiry, namely, whether the connection between England and India is of profit to the Indian people—and to the further question whether the Indian people regard it as of profit—I have come to conclusions on the whole favourable to that connection.

My argument, in a few words, has been this: seeking the balance of good and evil, I have found, on the one hand, a vast economic disturbance, caused partly by the selfish commercial policy of the English Government, partly by the no less selfish expenditure of the English official class.

I have found the Indian peasantry poor in some districts to starvation, deeply in debt, and without means of improving their position; the wealth accumulated in a few great cities and in a few rich hands; the public revenue spent to a large extent abroad, and by an absentee Government. I have been unable to convince myself that the India of 1885 is not a poorer country, take it altogether, than it was a hundred years ago, when we first began to manage its finances. I believe, in common with all native economists, that its modern system of finance is unsound, that far too large a revenue is raised from the land, and that it is only maintained at its present high figure by drawing on what may be called the capital of the country, namely, the material welfare of the agricultural class—probably, too, the productive power of the soil. I find a large public debt, and foresee further financial difficulties.

Again, I find the ancient organisation of society broken up, the interdependence of class and class disturbed, the simple customary law of the East replaced by a complicated jurisprudence imported from the West, increased powers given to the recovery of debt, and consequently increased facilities for litigation and usury. Also great centralisation of power in the hands of officers daily more and more automatons and less and less interested in the special districts they administer. In a word, new machinery replacing, in many points disadvantageously, the old. I do not say that all these things are unprofitable, but they are not natural to the country, and are costly out of proportion to their effect of good. India has appeared to me at best in the light of a large estate which has been experimented on by a series of Scotch bailiffs, who have all gone away rich. Everything is very scientific, very trim, and very new, especially the bailiff's own house; but the farms can be only worked now by skilled labourers

and at enormous expense ; while a huge capital has been sunk, and the accounts won't bear looking into.

On the other side, I have found an end put to the internecine wars of former days, peace established, security for life given, and a settled order of things on which men can count. I have never heard a native of India underrate the advantage of this, nor of the corresponding enfranchisement of the mind from the bondage in which it used to lie. A certain atmosphere of political freedom is necessary for intellectual growth. Where men were liable to fine, imprisonment, and death for their opinions there could be no general advance of ideas, and the want of personal liberty had for centuries held India in mental chains. No one had dared to think more wisely than his fellows, or doing so, had speedily been stopped by force from teaching it to others. But under English rule, with all its defects, thought has been free, and men who dared to think have kept their heads, so that a generation has sprung up to whom liberty of opinion has seemed natural, and with it has come courage. The Indians in the towns are now highly educated, write books, found newspapers, attend meetings, make tours of public lectures, think, speak, and argue fearlessly, and an immense revival of intellectual and moral energy has been the result. It is not a small thing, again, that the gross licence of the old princely courts has given place to a more healthy life—that crime in high places is no longer common ; that sorcery, poisoning, domestic murder, and lives of senseless depravity are disappearing ; that the burning of widows has been abolished, and child marriage is now being agitated against. These things are distinct gains, which no candid Englishman, any more than do the candid natives, would dream of underrating. And, as I have said before, they supply that element of hope which contains in it a germ of redemption from all other evils. This is the “*per contra*” of gain to be set in the balance against India's loss through England.

It would, therefore, be more than rash for Indian patriotism to condemn the English connection. Nor does it yet condemn it. There is hardly, I believe, an intelligent and single-minded man in the three Presidencies who would view with complacency the prospect of immediate separation for his country from the English Crown. To say nothing of dangers from without, there are dangers from within well recognised by all. The Indians are no single race ; they profess no one creed, they speak no one language ; highly civilised as portions of their society are, it contains within its borders portions wholly savage. There are tribes in all the hills still armed with spear and shield, and the bulk of the peaceful agricultural population is still in the rudest ignorance. The work of education is not yet complete, or the need of protection passed. All recognise this, and with it the necessity for India still of an armed Imperial rule. Were

this withdrawn, it is at least certain that the present civilised political structure could not endure, and it is exceedingly doubtful whether any other could be found to take its place. I do not myself see in what way the issue of a rupture could be made profitable to the Indian nations, nor do I understand that the exchange from English to another foreign rule would improve their condition.

At the same time I recognise that it is impossible the present condition of things should remain unchanged for more than a very few years. For reasons which I have stated, the actual organisation of Anglo-Indian government has become hateful to the natives of India, and however much their reason may be on the side of patience, there is a daily increasing danger of its being overpowered by a passionate sentiment evoked by some chance outbreak. Nor do I believe that it will be again possible for England to master a military revolt, which would this time have the sympathy of the whole people. Moreover, even if we should suppose this fear exaggerated and the evil day of revolt put off, there is yet the certainty of a Government by force becoming yearly more costly and more difficult to carry on. It is a mistake to suppose that India has ever yet been governed merely by the English sword. The consent of the people has always underlain the exercise of our power, and were this generally withdrawn it could not be maintained an hour. At present the Indian populations accept English rule as on the whole a thing good for them, and give it their support. But they do not like it, and were they once convinced that there was no intention on the part of the English people to do them better justice and give them greater liberty than they have now, they might without actual revolt make all government impossible. We have had a foretaste of what passive obstruction can do in Egypt, and the art may well spread to India. It cannot be too emphatically stated that our Indian administration exists on the goodwill of the native employés.

Lastly, without being alarmists, or seeing anything immediately dangerous in Russian or other plots, we must be prepared to see India yearly become less closely scaled a land. Nothing is more certain than that inimical European thought, if not European diplomacy, will busy itself with the disaffection of our Indian fellow-subjects if they become disaffected, and will encourage them to resistance, and will point out the means and the opportunity. Russia, the friend to India, the professed liberator of the Indian serf, the ally, let us suppose, of the Sultan and protector of Islam, would be no inconsiderable embarrassment to Imperial finance, not to say danger, if appearing on the Indian border. For all these reasons it behoves us surely not to drive Indian feeling into lines wholly hostile to us. It is too great a risk, too great a waste of power. This has been my argument in favour of reform.

But what then, in effect, should that reform be, and towards what ultimate goal should reformers look in shaping their desires and leading the newly awakened thought of India towards a practical end? While I was at Calcutta I attended a series of meetings at which this question was put in all its branches, and at which delegates from all parts of India discussed it fully; and in what I am now going to say I can therefore give, with more or less accuracy, the native Indian view of Indian needs. Many matters of social importance were debated there, many suggestions made of improvements in this and that department of the administration, and the financial and economic difficulties found their separate exponents; but it was easy to remark that while all looked forward to the realisation of their special hopes, none seemed to consider it possible that any real change would be effected as long as what may be called the constitution of the Indian Government remained what it now is. The burden of every argument was, "No reform is possible for us until the Indian Government is itself reformed. It is too conservative, too selfish, too alien to the thoughts and needs of India, to effect anything as at present constituted; and just as in England reformers at the beginning of this century looked first to reform of Parliament, so must Indian reformers now look first to a reform of the governing body of the country." Constitutional changes are needed as an initial step towards improvement; and it is the strong opinion of all that nothing short of this will either satisfy Indian hopes or ward off Indian troubles.

The Indian Government as at present constituted is a legacy from days when the advantage of the natives of India was not even in name the first object with its rulers. Its direct ancestor, the East India Company, was a foreign trade corporation which had got possession of the land, and treated it as a property to be managed for the exclusive advantage of its members, either in the form of interest on the Company's capital, or of lucrative employment for relatives and friends of the shareholders. The advantage of the natives was not considered, except in so far as their prosperity affected that of the Company; and in early days there was no pretence even of this. India was a rich country, and for many years was held to be an inexhaustible mine of wealth, and was treated without scruple as such. Nor was it till the trial of Warren Hastings that any great scandal arose or any serious check was put to the greediness of all concerned. The directors in London, and their servants in the three Presidencies, had a common object of making money, and the only differences between them were as to the division of profits, while all alike grew rich.

The Government of the country was then vested in a Board of Directors sitting at the India House, and delegating their executive powers to a civil service of which they themselves had in most

instances been originally members, and whose traditions and instincts they preserved. It was a bureaucracy pure and simple, the most absolute, the closest, and the freest of control that the world has ever seen; for, unlike the bureaucracies of Europe, it was subject neither to the will of a sovereign nor to public opinion in any form. Its selfishness was checked only by the individual good feeling of its members, and any good effected by it to others than these was due to a certain traditional largeness of idea as to the true interests of the Company. It was only on the occasion of the renewal of the Company's charter that any interference could be looked for from the English Parliament and public; and so it continued until the Mutiny.

In 1858, however, the Company as a Company came to an end. The Board of Directors was abolished, dividends ceased to be paid to owners of Indian stock, and the Government of India was transferred nominally to the English Crown. At that time there was a great talk of reforming the system of administration, and it was publicly announced that India should for the future be governed in no other interest than its own. A royal proclamation gave the natives of British India their full status as British subjects; they were no longer to be disqualified for any function of public trust, and no favour was to be shown to English rather than to native interests in the Imperial policy. The programme was an excellent one, and was received in India with enthusiasm, and caused a real outburst of loyalty to the English Crown which has hardly yet subsided. Its only fault, indeed, has been that it has never been carried out, and that while the Indians have waited patiently the plan has been defeated in detail by vested interests too strong for the vacillating intentions either of the Government which designed the change, or of any that have succeeded it. In spite of all official announcements and statements of policy, and royal proclamations, the principle of Indian government remains what it has always been—that is to say, government in the interests of English trade and English adventure. The more liberal design has faded out of sight.

The explanation of so great a failure I believe is this. When the sovereign power was transferred from the Company to the Crown, it was considered convenient to preserve as far as possible the existing machinery of administration. The East India Company had formed a civil service composed of its own English nominees, whose interests had gradually become part and parcel of the general interest of the concern; and they had obtained rights under covenant which secured them in employment, each for his term of years, and afterwards in pension. These rights the English Government now recognised, and the same covenant was entered into with them as had formerly been granted by the Company, and thus a vested interest in administra-

tion was perpetuated which has ever since impeded the course of liberal development.

The only real change introduced in 1858 was to substitute appointment by examination for appointment by nomination; but the composition of the service has remained practically the same, and the English covenanted civilian is still, as he was in the days of the Company, the practical owner of India. His position is that of member of a corporation, irremovable, irresponsible, and amenable to no authority but that of his fellow-members. In him is vested all administrative powers, the disposal of all revenue, and the appointment to all subordinate posts. He is, in fact, the Government, and a Government of the most absolute kind.

But the covenanted Civil Service is also a wholly conservative body. Composed though it may be admitted to be in large part of excellent and honest men—men who do their duty, and sometimes more than their duty—it has nevertheless the necessary vice of all corporations. Its first law is its own interests; its second only those of the Indian people. Nor is it casting a reflection on its members to state this. There has never been found yet a body of men anxious to benefit the world at large at the expense of its own pocket; and the Indian Civil Service, which is no exception to the rule, sees in all reform an economy of its pay, a curtailment of its privileges, and a restriction of its field of adventure. Such a service is of its very nature intolerant of economy and intolerant of change.

When, therefore, I say, in common with all native reformers, that the first reform of all in India must be a reform of its covenanted Civil Service, I am advocating primarily the removal of an obstruction. But the covenanted service is also at the present day an anachronism and an entirely needless expense. Fifty, and forty, and even twenty-five years ago, it may have been necessary to contract on extravagant terms and for life with Englishmen of education, in order to obtain their services in so remote a country as India then was. Such men a generation ago were comparatively rare, and the India House, and after it the India Office, may have been right in establishing a special privileged service for its needs, and in granting the covenants it made with them. But modern times have altered all this, and now the supply of capacity is so great that quite as good an article can be obtained without any covenant at all. The commercial companies have all long ago abandoned the old idea, and get their servants for India now as for other parts of the world, in the open market; nor do they find the quality inferior because they enter into no lifelong engagements with them. And so also the Indian Government must do in times to come if it is to keep its head financially above water. It is altogether absurd at the present day to contract with men on the basis of their right to be

employed and pensioned at extravagant rates as long as they live. It is not done in the English diplomatic service, whose duties are somewhat similar, nor in any other civil service that I know of. I feel certain that as good Englishmen could be obtained now at a third of the pay, and without any further covenant than the usual one of employment during good behaviour, as are now at the present rates and under the present conditions. If not, it would be far better to dispense with English service altogether, except in the highest grades, and employ natives of the country at the lower rates, which would still be high rates to them. The excessive employment of Englishmen has been a growth of comparatively recent date, and is working harm in every way.

Instead of the covenanted Civil Service, therefore, there would be an uncovenanted service obtained in the open market, and endowed with no more special privileges than our services at home. The members of this would then be under control and, in a true sense of the word, the servants of the State. Now they are its masters.

That they are its masters has been abundantly proved by the success of their efforts to thwart Lord Ripon's policy during the last three years. Lord Ripon came out to India on the full tide of the Midlothian victory, and quite in earnest about carrying out Midlothian ideas; nor has he faltered since. But the net result of his vice-royalty has been almost nil. Every measure that he has brought forward has been defeated in detail; and so powerful has the Civil Service been that they have forced the home Government into an abandonment, step by step, of all its Indian policy. This they have effected in part by open opposition, in part by covert encouragement of the English lay element, in part by working through the English press. When I arrived in India I found Lord Ripon like a school-boy who has started in a race with his fellows and who has run loyally ahead, unaware as yet that these had stopped, and that all the world was laughing at his useless zeal. The Anglo-Indian bureaucracy had shown itself his master in spite of Midlothian.

But if the covenanted Civil Service is an obstructive and burdensome legacy from the defunct Company, so too is the constitution of the Indian Government in London. In 1858, when the Company came to an end, the India House was replaced by the India Office, and the Board of Directors by the India Council: a change which was doubtless intended to signify much, but which in practice has come to signify hardly anything at all. The India Office represents of necessity the traditions of the past, and the Council, which was designed to check it, has proved a more conservative and acquiescent body than even the old Board of Directors, its prototype and model. The reason of this is obvious. The Council, composed as it is almost exclusively of retired civil or military servants, views Indian matters

from the point of view only of the Anglo-Indian service. It is even less amenable than this is to the influence of new ideas, and is more completely out of touch with modern native thought. Its experience is always that of a generation back, not of the present day, and it refuses, more persistently even than the younger generation in active service, to admit the idea of change.

Thus the Secretary of State, who is dependent on this blind guide, is in no other position at home than is the Viceroy in India. Ignorant, as a rule, of all things Indian, and dependent for advice on the India Office and his Anglo-Indian Council, he never gets at the truth of things, and blunders blindly on as they direct. It is almost impossible for him, however robust his will, to hold his own as a reformer.

The reforms, therefore, at home and in India which native opinion most strongly and immediately demands are, as regards India, that the active Civil Service should be remodelled, by the abolition of all covenants for lifelong employment, and by the liberal infusion of native blood into the non-covenanted service. It is proposed that as vacancies occur a certain proportion—say a third or a fourth—should be reserved exclusively for men of Indian birth, and that thus by degrees the whole Civil Service, with the exception of the highest posts, should become indigenous. Also, as regards the Government at home, that the Secretary of State for India should have the advice of native as well as Anglo-Indian retired officials on his Council in London. Until this is done they consider that the Government of India will continue to be carried on in the dark, and thus that reform will remain as hitherto, abortive.

It is obvious, however, that such initial changes are a first step only in the direction of reforms infinitely more important. What India really asks for as the goal of her ambitions is self-government—that is to say, that not merely executive but legislative and financial power should be vested in native hands. At present the legislative authority of each Presidency resides in the Governor in Council, and there is no system whatsoever of popular representation, even of the most limited kind. The Councils are composed wholly of nominees, and, except in very small measure, of English official nominees, and their functions are limited to consultation and advice, for they are without any real power of initiative or even of veto. In each of these Councils a few natives have been given places, but they are in no sense representatives of the people, being, on the contrary, nominees of the Government, chosen specially for their subservience to the ideas of the Governor of the day; and their independence is effectually debarred by the further check that their appointment is for three years only, and reversible at the end of such period by the simple will of the Governor. All the other members—and they form the large majority—are English civil or military officers, who look to



appointments on the Councils as the prizes of their service, and who usually represent the quintessence of official ideas. Lord Ripon, indeed, took pains to get together men of a liberal sort in his own supreme Council; but as a rule those who enjoy this position are anxious only to secure reappointment at the end of their three years' term. Thus, instead of representing the ideas current among the native classes from which they spring, they serve only as an echo or chorus to the Governor, or to the permanent officials who sway the Governor. This is not a healthy condition of things. The remedy should be, as a first condition, that the native councillors should be elected by the various classes of the community, and that their tenure of office should be made independent of the Governor's pleasure. The system has for years been practised with full success in Ceylon, where each section of the native community elects its representative to the Council, and where in consequence considerable courage and initiative have been infused into that body. In India I am convinced that the system would work with equally good results; and if also the number of councillors were increased and their powers of debate and interpellation enlarged, an excellent basis would be laid for what all Indian reformers look to as the ideal of their hopes, provincial parliaments. That India is unfit for local parliamentary institutions of at least a rudimentary kind I cannot at all admit. Indeed it seems to me that few people would profit more rapidly from a public discussion of public affairs than the temperate conservative Hindoos. For a while, indeed, it would doubtless be necessary, as in Ceylon, to retain a large English element in their councils, but the Indian mind educates itself with great rapidity, and in another generation they might probably without danger be entrusted with the sole care of their own domestic legislation, and the sole control of their finances.

At the same time, I would not be understood as advocating for India anything in the shape of an Imperial parliament. Empires and parliaments to my mind have very little in common with each other; and India is far too vast a continent, and inhabited by races far too heterogeneous, to make amalgamation in a single assembly possible for representatives elected on any conceivable system. Possibly in the dim future some such thing might be, but not in the lifetime of anyone now living, and any attempts of the sort at present would find for themselves the inevitable fate of the Tower of Babel. The Imperial power should, on the contrary, if it is to be effective, remain in the hands of a single man; and instead of weakening the Viceroy's authority I would rather see it strengthened. But with the provinces, and for all provincial affairs, self-government is a growing necessity, and the present age is quite capable of witnessing it in practice.

The crying need of India is economy, and for this the decentralisation of finance is the only cure. Each province should have its own budget and its own civil lists, which should be voted annually by the Council of the province. Its civil service should be its own, its police its own, and its public works its own, without any right of interference from Calcutta, or any confusion of provincial with Imperial accounts. At present, from the vastness of the country ruled and the variety of Imperial services which have their seat at Calcutta or Simla, waste and jobbery receive no adequate check. Places are multiplied, men without local knowledge are employed, and the accounts are confused. Supervision by those who bear the burdens of taxation under such a system is all but impossible, and no one knows precisely how and why the expenses charged in the general budget are incurred. But, were the provincial accounts held strictly separate, and subjected to the inquisition of a local assembly composed of men who, as natives of the province, would know the needs and capabilities of the province, none of the present abuses would have a chance of surviving. With the best will in the world, the heads of departments at Calcutta cannot really control the details of expenditure in Madras or the Punjab, and as a matter of fact there is everywhere enormous waste and enormous jobbery.

I should like, therefore, to see each province of India entirely self-managed as regards all civil matters, raising its own revenue in its own way, providing for its own needs of internal order, public works, and administration of all kinds, and controlled by the constant supervision of its own provincial assembly. In this way it would be possible to differentiate at once between the various provinces as to their special needs and the composition of their special services. In some the expenditure, and with it the taxation, might be at the outset reduced by the employment almost entirely of native servants; in others the substitution of native for English service would have to be more gradual. In some, large public works might be profitably afforded; in others, economy would have to be the rule. In all there would be an incentive to reduce unnecessary expenditure, seeing that the burden of providing for it would fall directly on the province.

On the other hand it is clear that, as long as India remains under the protection of England, certain charges on the revenue and certain executive and legislative functions would have to remain Imperial. These would be first, charges and responsibilities in respect of the army and navy; secondly, the diplomatic relations; thirdly, the general debt; and fourthly, the customs.

With regard to the army, there can be no doubt that the charge should be an Imperial one, for though Southern India has little need of troops to preserve order within her borders, she enjoys, in common with the North, that immunity from invasion which the army alone

can guarantee, and she should have an equal share of the burden of its cost. To adopt a system of provincial armies would, in my view of the case, be both a mistake of economy, and an injustice to those provinces which lie upon the frontier, as well as a considerable danger from the rivalries they might engender: a mistake of economy, inasmuch as the higher commands would be multiplied, and the less warlike provinces would at an equal cost provide inferior material to the general strength of the empire; an injustice, inasmuch as the North-Western provinces would have to bear nearly the entire burden of defence. Strongly, therefore, as I advocate decentralisation in all matters of civil administration, I as strongly advocate centralisation in matters military. The Imperial army, according to my ideas, should be under the sole control of the Viceroy, officered, I think, by Englishmen, and composed of the best fighting material to be obtained in India, irrespective of prejudice in favour of this or that recruiting ground. It is manifestly the first condition of an army that it should be efficient, and the second that it should be without political colour, and on both grounds I am inclined to think that Englishmen would prove more useful servants to India in a military capacity than any native class of officers could be. Much as I believe in Indian capacity for civil duties, I accept it as a fact that Englishmen make better commanders of troops, and are worth more even in proportion to their superior pay; while there is no question that they would be exempt, as native officers would not, from religious and caste influences, and thus more reliable as impartial executors of Imperial orders. The Indian Sepoy army, then, as I would see it, should be as distinctly Imperial and English as the civil services should be provincial and native. In saying this I am stating my private opinion only—I believe that native opinion is in favour of native military service. But, as I understand India, the time has not come for that. When India is a nation it will be time enough to think of a national army.

The diplomatic relations, again, of India must of necessity remain Imperial, and their management vested solely in the Viceroy. Indian diplomacy, as at present managed, is a complicated and costly thing; but in the India of the future we may hope this will be much simplified. Two cardinal points of policy might with advantage be observed: the first, to keep wholly apart from foreign intrigues and foreign wars; the second, to keep rigid faith with the still independent native princes within the border. Of foreign wars India has long had enough, and more than enough. The Chinese, the Persian, the Afghan, the Abyssinian, the Egyptian, and now the Soudanese, all these India has been forced to take part in, sorely against her interest and her will. Apart from their money loss, there is in these wars a loss of dignity, which the Indian people are beginning to resent. Those who have been educated in the humane literature of Europe

find it humiliating that they, a conquered people, should be used as the instrument for conquering others. What quarrel had India with the unfortunate Egyptians? What quarrel has she with the unfortunate Arabs? The educated Indians resent it bitterly, too, that India is made to pay the cost. But these things need no comment. They are but a part of that absolute selfishness which has been the principle of all our past relations with India, and in the new birth of India these too must be changed. The diplomatic relations with the native States have been a tissue of fraud and aggression. In the policy of the future, aggression must be abandoned. There is but one true policy towards the native States and that is, by giving them the spectacle of a British India more happy than their own to invite their inhabitants to share its advantages. Who can doubt that were India self-governed, prosperous, and happy, the old native principalities would one by one spontaneously be merged in it.

With regard to the Debt, much as we may regret that it was ever incurred, it must remain, I fear, in our new India a charge on the Imperial Government. Its annual interest, like the cost of war and diplomacy, should be apportioned as a fixed charge to each province in proportion to that province's wealth, except in so far as it relates to the guarantees of railways, which might be made a charge on the provinces served by them. It should, however, be a cardinal point of policy that no further debt should be incurred and no further guarantees given for Imperial works. The provinces henceforth should be charged with all works of communication, irrigation, and improvement, the utility of which they will best appreciate.

Remain the Customs. These too must remain an Imperial matter; and it may be hoped that when in the future India's interest, not England's, comes to be considered in her government, they may be made to return a fair profit to balance some of the Imperial charges. To India free trade has proved no blessing, and a return to import duties is a first principle of sound finance, which self-governing India will undoubtedly insist on. The majority, I believe, of our English colonies see their advantage in these, and so will India, unless, indeed, some fair equivalent be given. As it is, all the profit is on England's side, on India's all the loss.

Such, very briefly and imperfectly given, is my scheme of self-government for India. That it is one possible—I do not say easy—to realise few will doubt who have marked the wonderful success achieved in a case not very dissimilar nearer our own shores. The Empire of Austria, within the recollection of men of the present generation, was a bureaucratic despotism of the harshest and least sympathetic kind. It had got within its rule, by conquest or inheritance, a half score of nations, owning no ties of birth or language, and united only by a common hatred of their oppressors. The Austrian

official of 1847 was a bye-word of arrogance and self-sufficient pride, and while vaunting to the world the virtues of his own method of rule, was preparing the way for a general revolt against the Empire. Few who watched the history of those days believed that Austria was not doomed to perish, and none that she was destined to achieve the love of her people. Yet we have lived to see this. We have lived to see the Hungarians reconciled, and the very Poles who in their despair had filled Europe for fifty years with their denunciations, thanking Austria for her share in their ruin. If this has been possible through the gift of self-government, all things are possible; and India by the same means of honest government, each province for itself, may become happy and thankful, as the Austrian nations have. One principle keeps these together without force, their loyalty to the wearer of the Imperial crown; and fortunately this is a principle we have in India already framed to our hand. There is no question that the Indian populations are possessed with a strong feeling of personal attachment for her Majesty the Queen, and while they grow yearly more and more estranged from their Anglo-Indian masters they yearly look with more and more hope to England and to her who sits upon the English throne. This is a sentiment of the utmost value, and one which may yet prove the salvation of the Indian Empire, in spite of all the Anglo-Indians can do to wreck it. I look to it in the future as the true bond of union which shall retain for us India, not as our inheritance, for it will not be ours to possess, but as a co-heir to our good fortunes. India will not then be lost to England, but will remain to us a far greater glory than now, because it will have become a monument of what we shall have been able to achieve for the benefit of others, not merely for ourselves.

I dare not, however, dwell too much upon this prospect. I know the huge perils which surround the birth of every new thing in the political world, and I know the unscrupulous rage of vested interests threatened. The interests of the Anglo-Indians stand stoutly in our way, and the interests of an ever more hungry commerce and an ever more pitiless finance. Commerce and finance find their gain in the present system. Manchester must be appeased before India can hope to live, and to stop suddenly the career of Indian extravagance would injure trade in many a North of England town. Debt in India unfortunately means dividends in Lombard Street; and so I dare not hope. I am tempted rather to quote as only too likely to prove true certain desponding words which I once heard uttered by General Gordon when, speaking of the prospects of reform in India, he told me, "You may do what you will. It will be of no use. India will never be reformed until there has been there a new revolt." But what will that revolt be, and how will it leave our power of reformation?

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

## TASSO.

"Be sad, as we would make ye: think ye see the very persons of our noble story as they were living."—PROLOGUE TO HENRY VIII.

"LONG live the supreme master of art, Goethe!" shouted the enthusiastic students of Halle, when the great man visited little Lauchstadt in order to be present at the opening of its theatre; and our present enterprise will consist in some attempt to estimate and to enjoy one of the many-sided master's works which belongs emphatically to the region of pure art, and to contrast Goethe's treatment of the sad fortunes of Tasso at the Court of Ferrara with the historical basis upon which his poem is reared. The question of the comparative excellence of a dramatic poem and a poetical drama is an old and even a vexed one. Without stopping to decide which is the higher form of art product, we shall do wisely to enjoy both forms, each in its own sphere. We may take delight in *Comus* and in "Philip van Artevelde," without lessening our admiration for *Hamlet* and *Othello*. For the *dernier mot* on the subject, we cannot do better than cite Goethe himself. He says: "It must be said, loudly and clearly, that the reader must stand apart from the spectator and hearer; each has his own rights, and neither must trench upon the rights of the others."

"*Torquato Tasso, ein Schauspiel*," is, primarily, written for readers. It does not fully answer the demands of the acting drama, or the exigencies of stage requirement; but, to the reader, its worth and charm are not lessened by the want of dramatic action or of stage vitality. It may be no *drama*, in the full and proper sense of the word, but it is a dramatic poem of rare and high beauty. It is full of æsthetic ideality, and it flows in subtle music and in tender harmony, through a series of mighty and of faultless lines. Goethe approached the sad story of Tasso's love from the side of poetic idealism rather than from that of acting attrition; the conflicts that he depicted were those that work within the soul. The treatment that he devoted to his theme was subjective. In part, this style of treatment was dictated by the essence of the subject itself, as that presented itself in form and shape within his own mind. In *Faust*, in *Egmont*, in *Clarigo*, in *Götz*, he is far more dramatic, and shows a stronger sympathy with the acting-drama. "I have never admitted an affectation into my poetry," he tells Eckermann. He could not live or work in a falsehood. He would not, in his old age, sit in a room and write war-songs when he was not inspired by military feeling, or by hatred; nor would he, when he approached the theme of Tasso's sorrows, treat his subject with a stage vitalism which to his art-sense was antagonistic to the subject's essence and spirit.

In his poem he disdains theatrical effect. Those things in a drama which most strongly move a public did not, perhaps, most deeply touch him, and he was too genuine ever to affect or to misemploy them. In connection with Tasso, he cannot strike fire out of the attrition of event and incident; he does not care for the conflict and contact of passion. Nay, he does not even strive for the pathetic; he does not seek to touch the reader's heart. The sad romance of a poet's hapless love he deals with loftily and through a vision of poetic ideality. He is a law to himself. Schiller was a much more effective theatre-poet, and would have made Tasso's story popular and strong, of stage effect and of dramatic working; but Schiller never could have written a poem which would have appealed, as Goethe's *Tasso* does, to the critical and cultivated few. Goethe's readers must supply the place of auditors or of spectators. The full-handed reverberation of popular applause must ever be wanting to the German poet's treatment of the woes of the Italian poet; but in the "sessions of sweet silent thought" the poem of the Swan of Weimar will linger in the charmed memories of those high, rare readers, who will not willingly let its echoes die. *Tasso* is not so fit for the glare of the crowded theatre as it is for the quiet joy shone upon by the solitary reading-lamp. At the same time it must be remembered that there is work of the quiet superlative class which is as effective on the boards as it is delightful in the closet. *Hamlet* is, perhaps, almost better to read than it is to be seen. Unless it be played as it but rarely can be, it is pleasanter to read than it is even to see this profoundly thoughtful tragedy. The interpreters who, within the "wooden O," make the characters act and live, may also sometimes coarsen our conceptions of the poet's delicate poetical intentions. The acting drama has its strongest influence in an objective age—in a time in which men see and hear, but do not often read. Goethe's *Tasso* belongs to a day in which all men could read.

It is always interesting to consider the bases upon which great dramatists have built up their works. Rarely has a dramatic poet of the first rank invented a plot or story. Incident is the mere basis upon which dramatic creation begins its work. An historical character, an historical epoch, a legend, or a chronicle, have usually furnished the raw materials out of which the poet has made a play. Take the four great abstract tragedies of *Hamlet*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*. Three are based upon half-legendary chronicles; the other was suggested by an unimportant Italian novel. Goethe's plays are founded upon legend, tale, or history. In truth the invention of the dramatist begins to work after the outline of incident, or the material of event, have been supplied from other sources. Goethe's *Tasso* is, of course, based upon the *Tasso* of history; and in order to enable us to appreciate his creative treatment of the historical character, it will be worth our while to consider briefly the bald but

suggestive records of the poet who once lived and loved, who suffered and who sang.

Ariosto was the poetical glory of the court of Ferrara under Alfonso I. Tasso occupies the same position—though the position is modified by a very different fate and issue—at the court of Alfonso II. Lucrezia Borgia made her entry into Ferrara as the tainted wife of the dark duke, Alfonso I., in 1502. The son of this Alfonso, and of the daughter of Alexander VI., Duke Ercole II., succeeded his father, and reigned until his death in October, 1559. This son of Lucrezia Borgia married Renea, daughter of Louis XII., and his wife became an enthusiast for the Reformation. Calvin and Clement Marot both found shelter from persecution at the court of Ferrara, and this shelter was accorded, not by the Duke, but by the brave and generous Duchess. Lucrezia Borgia never saw her daughter-in-law; nor would the daughter of Rodrigo Borgia easily have believed that her son's wife would be the enemy of that Church which had had as its chiefs a Borgia, a Rovere, a Medici. The Rovere family called Renea "a monster"; and her husband, when, in 1554, he detected her heretical tendencies, immured his duchess in a cloister. When the Holy Office began its work in Ferrara, the Dowager-duchess Renea escaped to France, where she lived in communion with the Huguenots, and where, in her castle of Montargis, she died in 1575. Renea brought to her husband several children. These were, the hereditary prince, afterwards Alfonso II.—this is Goethe's and Tasso's Alfonso;—Luigi, who became a Cardinal; Donna Anna, married to the Duke of Guise; Donna Lucrezia, who became Duchess of Urbino; and Donna Leonora—this is Goethe's and Tasso's Leonora—who died unmarried. Alfonso II. began his reign in 1559, while his widowed mother was alive and restrained in a convent. Alfonso died in 1597. He was not unmarried, but remained childless; and with him died out the direct male line of the proud and ancient house of Este.

He was succeeded by his cousin, of base blood, Don Cæsar, the grandson of Alfonso I.; but the Pope refused to recognise Don Cæsar as the heir of Ferrara, and the unfortunate man had to submit to a decree of Clement VIII., pronounced 13th January, 1598, and ceded his claims upon the Duchy. He withdrew to Modena with the barren title of Duke of a city. He had in him no strain of the blood of Borgia, but he had that of Laura Diante. Ferrara passed, through the Archduke Ferdinand, at the end of the eighteenth century, to the House of Austria-Este.

Space restricts me to a very curt allusion to the Tasso of fact before passing on to the Tasso of fiction; but, ere we leave the Tasso of history for the Tasso of Goethe, I must yet rapidly summarise the known events in the life of one poet, in so far as those formed the basis of another and a greater poet's picture of the Italian bard.



Torquato Tasso was born at Sorrento in 1544. He was therefore twenty years old at the date of Shakspeare's birth. In Italy the epic and the sonnet still remained the forms of art in which poetry worked. In England the drama of the Elizabethan age was attracting to its powerful field of working the highest poetical genius of the time. The influence of Italian literature was strong in England, and the ideals which animated Tasso were the same as those which stirred Sidney. Love, chivalry, romance, noble war, knightly prowess, were the themes which inspired both; and *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, the production of Sidney's "high-erected thoughts seated in a heart of courtesy," took its delight in scenes, actions, characters, which were not dissimilar in very essence to those of *La Gerusalemme Liberata*. The patron who introduced Tasso, then the author of *Rinaldo*, to the court of Ferrara, was the Cardinal Luigi d'Este, the brother of Alfonso II. The two sisters, Lucrezia and Leonora, were then at court, though the former was soon, as wife of the Duke of Urbino, to quit Ferrara. Tasso conceived a mad, stealthy passion for the unmarried sister of his Prince. His disclosure of his frantic passion was long restrained by a just dread of consequences. Forgetting that disparity of rank which was so strong a factor in Italy in the sixteenth century, he dared to indulge lawless and audacious hopes. Nay, more; he ventured, as Professor Rosini records in his *Life of Tasso, and causes of his imprisonment*, to write secretly, and to circulate stealthily, prurient verses, in which he boasted of favours which he had never received from the Princess. Such verses came, of course, in time, to the knowledge of Alfonso; and the proud Duke preferred to consider that the man who could write such loose songs in slander of a prince's sister was mad. The question of Tasso's madness is a difficult one. There was probably a strain of insanity in his vain and morbid mind; but it suited the Duke to impute madness, and it suited Tasso, lest a worse thing should befall him, to accept the imputation. He was condemned at first to a gentle, almost nominal, confinement in the monastery of St. Francis. He wandered restlessly and aimlessly to many cities—to Naples and Sorrento, to Mantua, to Paris. While in Paris, in the suite of Cardinal Luigi d'Este, Tasso had speech of Montaigne, and returned, under humiliating conditions, to Ferrara. In 1595 he was to be crowned with laurel in Rome; but then his last illness overcame him, and on 25th April, 1595, Tasso died in St. Onofrio. Many pilgrims have since read the inscription, *Torquati Tassi ossa hic jacent*.

Upon such a hint Goethe spake. The biographies of Tasso are not remarkable for insight into his character, and the chief record that remains is that of the bare incident of his unhappy and misplaced love, of his real or assumed madness, of his restless wanderings, of his unhappy end. It is almost needless to say that Goethe has not

adopted a realistic or even an historical picture of persons or of place. The real Alfonso, a "tyrant" of a small Italian court of the Renaissance, was a very different prince from the Alfonso that Goethe has drawn. The actual Leonora bore no resemblance to Goethe's noble princess. The relations between poet and lady were, in fact, widely unlike those which Goethe has pictured; and the treatment which Tasso received was something very remote from the dealings with him in the play. Goethe's treatment of his theme is wholly imaginative; but he has drawn his Tasso vibrating uneasily on that misty borderland which is the debateable ground between sanity and insanity. Goethe paints him with equal strength and delicacy, with spiritual insight and creating consistency; as a man sensitive, suspicious, morbid, self-conscious, envious, melancholy. He causes his own unhappiness, but unhappy he is. Goethe's study presents a clearer picture of Tasso himself than is to be obtained from the biographies. It is, perhaps, a study in morbid pathology; it is a portrait of a poet according to the popular acceptance of a poet—that is, of a poet who belongs wholly to the second rank in poetry. It in no manner presents poets such as Shakspeare or Goethe himself, men who were sovereign lords alike of their characters and their gift, but it depicts the inferior craftsman of poetry, whose character is overweighted by his talent. Goethe's Tasso is a weakling, eaten up by individual discontent at his own lot in the universe. He is impressionable, impulsive, angry, sullen, jealous; he is melancholy, sorrowful, because he believes the whole world to be his enemy. Full of a wrong sense of being wronged, Tasso has developed egotism to disease. He quiveringly repulses affection, friendship; and he rejects with irritated scorn the honours which his unhappy, self-tormenting temperament insists upon regarding as insults and as wrongs. He is miserable, but he is the author of his own misery. Gifted with the delicate nervous organization of a self-intoxicated poet who is doomed, as rougher men are, to grind out life among the iron wheels of necessity, we greatly pity and yet partly despise the poet who, without being wholly ignoble, cannot attain to the dignity of life based upon the noble foundations of his talent and his art. Ingenious in self-torment, he is ever in extremes of rapture or despair, and yet can never free himself from himself, or learn the value and the worth of life. Fond of show, luxury, pleasure; eager for recognition and greedy of praise, he cannot live in serene contentment with his own high gift and power. Vanity poisons his talent. For a poet of his day and land, his circumstances and his surroundings were of the happiest and the best; but he cannot win peace of mind or gain self-respect; and a certain restless littleness of spirit renders him capable of baseness towards benefactors, of malignity towards patron and towards friend. He has the flow and glow of fervid, even

though it be sometimes shallow, eloquence ; and his feeling is quick rather than deep. He misconceives the characters and actions of those who wish him well ; and in the exaggeration of morbid feeling his extreme conception of his own gift and merits raises up a monstrous apparition of want of recognition of his claims, a spectre of enmity on the part of those who regard and treat him with noble courtesy and tender consideration. His feverish dream of life is a false representation of life ; his view of his own lot is a wrong to those who seek to make it so fair and smooth. Such is the being that Goethe has conceived and created ; and such a poet is to be placed in conflict with such action as the noble art-style of the poem could admit.

The Princess—the Leonora whose name is so indissolubly connected with that of Tasso—is, in Goethe's play, a sweet and stately creation, tender as high hearted, noble in feeling as in thought. She is chaste and pure, enthusiastic in her love for poetry, full of tender regard for the poet whom she ranks so highly, but yet remaining true to the instincts of her order and the duties of her rank. If, in a lofty way, as the cold moon looks down upon the earth, she feels a kind of love for Tasso, that love is a love of the imagination, and is unmixed with passion or with heart. Goethe's Leonora could never fully return the love of Goethe's Tasso. When his audacious passion impels the poet to transgress the limits of modesty and to fold her in a wild embrace, the outraged Princess cries "Away!" and flies from her lawless adorer. The Princess could only love with honour. She could not help attracting, but she would never stoop to allure, nor could she descend from her pedestal to love *par amour*. The fair ideal court painted by Goethe is rather that of Weimar than of Ferrara, and belongs to a period later than the sensuous Renaissance. Jean Paul speaks of the "sweet orange-flower garland" of Goethe's poem ; but he adds that the Princess pictured by the German poet is, in essence, a German maiden, who can think and ponder over love, and who does not feel like an inhabitant of so warm a clime. Goethe's Tasso again is not, according to Jean Paul, an impulsive, passionate Italian, but is a reflective German, who only succeeds in unskillfully entangling himself in the perplexities of life and love.

It is indeed noteworthy how little *Zeitkolorit*, how little *couleur locale*, Goethe has bestowed upon his *Tasso*. The Renaissance was virtually "the Middle Ages in dissolution," and manners were corrupt while inclinations were irresistible. Italians of the sixteenth century were not given to introspection or analysis ; love was then a glowing or prurient passion, felt but not thought about. It might impel to madness or induce to crime ; but it was an impulse too simple, too passionate, too sensual, to be brooded over in self-questionings, to be checked by conscience, or restrained by thought. Goethe has painted

an Italian garden, rich with the perfume of orange-blossoms; but the fair figures that fill the Italian garden are not actuated by Italian feeling, do not throb with Italian blood. Leonora Sanvitale (also a Leonora), Countess of Scandiano, is the other female character in the play. She bears towards the Princess something of the relation which Emilia bears towards Desdemona. The fair Countess is married; but she is worldly, is a coquette, not too nice about points of honour, and she is voluptuous, sensuous, dangerous. Both ladies are full of a finer culture than that of the Italian *virago* of the Renaissance, and both are proud of being the friends and patronesses of a distinguished poet. The Countess is able and shrewd; she has experience both of life and love; and, but for Tasso's mad passion for the Princess, the second Leonora would gladly have rivalled the first in the love of the poet of knightly deeds and of romantic passions. Alfonso II., Duke of Ferrara, is magnanimous, wise, generous, and a princely master. He, too, belongs but imperfectly to his day and to Ferrara; nor is he without some traits that suggest Karl August, of Weimar.

Antonio Montecatino, ambassador and secretary of state, is drawn as an experienced, diplomatic, political man of the world and of the State. He is the natural antagonist of Tasso, whom he treats as a spoiled child and an unworthy favourite of the court. Antonio is manly, proud, and noble, but he is emphatically a man of the world and a man of action, and has but scant sympathy with the vain, irritable, morbid poet. He is somewhat cold and hard, and even-austerely scornful, towards the excitable singer, and holds in angry contempt Tasso's scandals against the Princess.

In the first act of Goethe's poem all the characters are poetically depicted and introduced; and, in the sunny garden of Belriguardo, we move among the graceful figures, we feel the fine manners, and recognise the delicate conventions of a noble, a cultured, an ideal court. The play "has a plan, but no plot." The whole action consists of an angry dialogue which leads to a challenge and an imprisonment, and to a violent embrace which compels banishment and entails misery. The play stops, but does not end; yet this conclusion, in which nothing is concluded, is found, upon consideration, to be the fitting and suggestive termination of the poem. The play is remarkable throughout for the tone and keeping of its lofty, ideal art style, for its masterly simplicity and unity, for the exalted harmony and beauty of its diction and dialogue. It is a play that can be enjoyed in isolated scenes and through particular passages. The imagination of the reader is so satisfied and delighted that he scarcely longs to become a spectator of the play in action on the boards.

The great scenes between Leonora and Tasso may not be theatrical, but are dramatic. The thoughts and feelings of either character are fully expressed; the poet has entered into the inner consciousness of lady and of bard, and has amply realised for the reader the opposing

eddies and currents of emotion which agitate hearts connected by attraction and divided by attrition. Tasso speaks rapturously of that Golden Age in which the only law of life was sweet desire. The Princess replies, that not the thing which is pleasant, but that which is fit and becoming, is lawful, according to noble law. In any other play the dramatist would certainly have provided the Countess with at least an intrigue, but Goethe, with fine art instinct, has restricted all the love in the poem to the gracious and graceful poet and princess. In *Tasso* there is no question of "native wood-notes wild." The art of the play is measured and restrained. It remains true to an æsthetic key-note; but the work has the rare charm and value of presenting always high thoughts floating and upborne upon waves of pure and liquid melody.

The presence of a poet permeates the poem, and the influences of a court surround all the actions of all the characters. Tasso's position and temperament are always clearly revealed. The physician says of him—

"Where'er he treads, he thinks himself surrounded  
By troops of foes."

The Princess tells him—

"But thou—O scarcely, after many years,  
Can'st thou succeed in finding thine own self  
Reflected in a friend."

Leonora can anticipate Rome, and place a wreath upon the poet's brow, but yet she sees into his character and distrusts its egotism.

Friends, wiser and more clear-seeing than is Tasso himself, often attempt, but always fail in the attempt, to reveal to him his inner and diseased self.

Alfonso bids him to

"Free thyself from thyself;"

and urges him to

"Learn, O learn, I pray thee, well to know the worth of life."

If the poet learn that, then

"The man will gain that which the poet yields."

The wise Antonio, with his clear, cold insight, says to the self-intoxicated bard whom he is vainly advising—

"Nathless, thou thinkest out of these my words  
A thing quite other than the thing I mean."

Again—

"Thou thyself show'st me why I scorn thee still;"

and the haughty minister knows that Tasso

" . . . . dares, in blasphemy,  
To libel, to defame, the very Princess."

Of the Princess's feeling towards Tasso, the astute Countess says—

“For her affection for the noble man  
Is like her other passions;—  
They shine as does the moon's calm, cold, still ray  
Feebly upon the wanderer of the night,  
And warm not.

\*       \*       \*       \*       \*       \*

She would rejoice  
If he were far, and if she knew him happy.”

The passage—

“There is no fairer sight in all the world  
Than is a prince that wisely knows to rule :  
His is the realm in which all pride obeys,  
Where each man seems to only serve himself  
Because he's only ordered to do right ”

may be held to apply more fitly to Weimar than to Ferrara.

Tasso's constant tendency to believe all the world, and his warmest friends, to be always in a conspiracy against him ; his unreasonable conduct towards the Duke ; his misunderstanding of Antonio and the Countess ; his imputation of mean and unworthy motives to straightforward and to friendly action ; his shameful and unwarranted declaration of love to the Princess—all these things point subtly to a state of sanity injured and endangered by vanity and egotism. Antonio is really a friend to Tasso, but is a friend who will not flatter, who cannot worship, who must despise. When Tasso, by his conduct towards Leonora, has compelled a breach with the kindly court, it rests with Antonio to speak the tender sentence, and that once spoken, the fair ideal life in the garden of Belriguardo—the garden in which the *Gerusalemme Liberata* is presented by Tasso to Alfonso, by poet to patron—vanishes into thin air ; the music ceases, and the sweet dream is an insubstantial pageant faded.

*Tasso* contains many of those mighty lines which, as quotations, are stored up in the treasure-house of a people's possessions of great thoughts set in fitting language. We must attempt to English, however imperfectly, one or two of the best-known passages. In Germany one constantly hears quoted the original of—

“If thou would'st fully know what manners mean,  
Then learn from noble women what they teach.

\*       \*       \*       \*       \*       \*

Where morals manners sway, there reigns the woman ;  
But there where license wallows, she is naught.  
And would'st thou the two sexes understand—  
Woman loves rule and order, freedom man.”

To the Princess are entrusted noble lines, in which a great poet pays due homage to the divinity of noble women.

Goethe first conceived his *Tasso* in 1780. The idea of the play-poem occurred to the poet on the occasion of a walk to Tiefurt. In 1780 he actually began the work, and on 7th of November, after

his return from Kochburg, he read the first scene to his "nearest and only public," Charlotte and Knebel. After the completion of the first act, he was compelled to lay the work aside; but he wrote a part of it in Rome, and re-wrote and finished the play after his return to Weimar.

He delayed for a very long time bringing his *Tasso* on the stage. He could not, he says, believe that *Tasso* could be successfully produced upon the boards; but in the second year after the death of Schiller he gave way to the pressure put upon him by actors and admirers, and consented to the performance of the play. The piece was first acted 16th of February, 1807, and was a great success in the Weimar Theatre. The noble picture which it presented of a fine and cultured court must have rendered the poem singularly attractive in the classic though then sorrowing city of Karl August. *Tasso* became a stock piece in Weimar, and remains a great festival play in Germany, though it is very difficult to obtain a complete cast. It can always be given by ideal actors to the delight of ideal audiences; but it never can be a popular or powerful acting play. On 14th February, 1810, *Tasso* was played to Goethe's entire satisfaction. He records: "It would be tempting God to expect that the piece should ever again be acted so well." Only a dramatic poet can fully realise the delight of seeing such a poem of his own worthily and triumphantly presented through the mimic life of the theatre. *Tasso* was produced in the time of the deep political humiliation of Germany, after the French had occupied and half ruined Weimar. It became then an object with Goethe to restore national respect by reviving the national drama, and when such a desire was paramount, *Tasso* could not be withheld from the boards.

The question of Goethe's abstract idea of *Tasso* as a poet, may be gathered from his statement made to Eckermann when, in 1824, the news reached him of the death of Byron. After Goethe had spoken with the warmest recognition and the highest praise of the great English poet, the conversation turned upon a comparison between *Tasso* and Byron, and Goethe said that he would not conceal his opinion of the immense superiority of Byron, "for intellect, human interest, and creative power;" and he added, "One cannot compare these poets without annihilating the one by the other. Byron is the burning thorn-bush that reduces to ashes the holy cedars of Lebanon. The great epic of the Italian has maintained its reputation for centuries, but one can kill the whole *Gerusalemme Liberata* with a single line of *Don Juan*."

To that reader for whom Goethe primarily worked when composing his ideal dramatic poem criticism must address itself when it essays to analyse and to enjoy the beauties and the meanings of his exquisite "*TORQUATO TASSO, EIN SCHAUSPIEL.*"

H. SCHÜTZ WILSON.

## THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

THE simple definition of banking is money-dealing. A banker properly so called is but a tradesman engaged in buying and selling money, that symbol of wealth which in all civilised countries facilitates or renders possible the exchange of commodities, which are wealth itself. A banker produces nothing, nor does he, except in a most indirect manner, add anything to the wealth of the country. His business is the collection and distribution of that general representative of merchandise, money, much in the same way as an ordinary shopkeeper collects and distributes the special articles of his individual trade. Joint-stock banks, then, are but co-operative distributing associations formed for the purpose of fighting against some real or fancied oppression, and of competing, to the supposed advantage of the public, with private enterprise. They are formed for the purpose of competing with private bankers whose business they appear to be gradually absorbing, possibly by a sort of process of the survival of the fittest. In this way the origin, in 1694, of the Bank of England, the parent joint-stock bank of the kingdom, and the largest and most important money-dealing institution in the world, may be traced to the combination of the Government, merchants, traders, and the general public to oppose the exactions, usury, and financial tyranny of the goldsmiths and stock-jobbers of the period. A very limited acquaintance with pamphlets published at the time of the Great Revolution will show that the Bank of England was the natural outcome of necessity, a necessity which guaranteed its success if honestly and prudently managed. Through its means the foundation of a safe paper currency was secured, the national credit maintained, and the system of usury and extortion prevalent throughout the country undermined—at the expense, it is true, of many so-called bankers, stock-jobbers, and goldsmiths, but to the great gain of the nation, its commerce, and the general public. Of the originator of the Bank of England—Mr. W. Paterson, who remained a director only for a year or two—we know really very little, except that he was equally the founder of the ill-fated Darien Expedition of 1698, that he was an able, honourable, and enthusiastic man, and that he died in Scotland, where, “pitied, respected, but neglected,” he lived for many years.

The original capital of the Bank was £1,200,000, which was subscribed in a few days. The whole of this amount was, as a condition of the charter, lent to the Government at eight per cent., the Bank being allowed an additional £4,000 a year for the management of the Government accounts. The necessary capital for carrying on the banking business appears to have been obtained from the public by



the issue of bank bills, termed by some flippant writers of the period "Speed's notes," from the name of the first chief cashier. These bills were evidently a sort of "deposit receipt," bearing interest at the rate of twopence per cent. per diem, or at the rate of three per cent. per annum, and they appear to have given sore offence to the goldsmiths. The Bank of England commenced business in the Mercers' Hall, Cheapside, where the first "General Court of Proprietors" was held. But after a few months, this situation being found inconvenient, an agreement was made with the Grocers' Company (which appears to have been in difficulties) for the use of their hall in Princes Street. The original working staff of the Bank consisted of fifty-four clerks, whose united salaries amounted to the modest sum of £4,340 a year, averaging a little more than £80 a year each. The chief cashier (Mr. T. Speed), the chief accountant, and the secretary received £250 a year each, and one clerk is scheduled in the pay-sheet as working "gratis." Addison, in No. 3 of the *Spectator*, gives us the following pleasant little glimpse of the Bank at work in 1710: "In one of my late rambles, or rather speculations, I looked into the great hall where the Bank is kept, and was not a little pleased to see the directors, secretaries, and clerks, with all the other members of that wealthy corporation, ranged in their several stations, according to the parts they act in that just and regular economy." From which it would seem that the Bank dignitaries of old had a firm belief in the virtues of the "master's eye," scorned bank parlours and private rooms, and were content to work with their servants *coram populo*—a good, homely, old-fashioned practice, no doubt, but one scarcely adapted to modern banking requirements. Bank of England directors in those days, however, had a good deal more to do with mere clerical duties than they have at present. They by no means shirked the most practical responsibilities of office, for we find that at that period, and for many years afterwards, even the warrants for the payments of dividends were signed by two of their body.

It was not until after the Bank had existed some forty years that the directors found the business so completely outgrow the accommodation afforded by the Grocers' Hall as to necessitate a separate building of its own. The foundation of the present building was laid in 1732 on the site of the residence of Sir John Houblon, the first governor of the Bank, and business was commenced in the new premises in 1734. The edifice was greatly enlarged between the years 1770 and 1786, and was completed, pretty much as it now stands, in 1786, an Act having been procured in 1780 to enable the directors to purchase the adjoining church, land, and parsonage—in fact the whole parish—of St. Christopher le Stocks, to the rector of which non-existent parish the Bank pay £400 a year to this day. The drawing office now stands on the site of the old church, the garden being the churchyard. In 1800, when Princes Street was widened,

the present wall-screen round the Bank was erected by Sir John Soane, giving a uniform appearance to the exterior of the building. There is much in the architectural interior of the Bank which is well worthy of admiration; for instance the quadrangle called the bullion-yard, in Lothbury, the garden, rotunda, and court rooms, &c. The long prison-like stone-coloured passages and offices devoted to public business, however, are singularly cold and cheerless, owing chiefly to some apparent, yet unaccountable, objection of the authorities to employ colour as a decorative auxiliary; possibly from a fixed but mistaken idea that colour is antagonistic to cleanliness and brightness to business.

Although the necessities of the State contributed to the establishment of the Bank of England, they were, at intervals of every few years, compelled, after making a feeble resistance, to purchase the continuance of their privileges on exceedingly onerous terms. The history of the seven renewals of the charter between 1694 and 1800, and of the accordance of permission to increase the capital of the Bank, is one continuous record of State exactions. The Bank, as a condition of State patronage, were on each successive occasion forced to increase their loans to the Government at low rates of interest or without any interest whatever, three millions sterling being lent for six years without interest in 1800. Interest on previous loans was reduced, exchequer bills were cancelled, and on one occasion a free gift of £110,000 was made to the State. As a consequence the Government debt to the Bank increased at a rapid rate, till it amounted at last to upwards of fourteen and a half millions sterling, or rather more than the whole capital of the Corporation. In 1833 the Government paid off one-fourth of this debt in reduced annuities, and thereby reduced it to £11,015,100, at which amount it now stands. While Ministry after Ministry thus accurately tested the pliability of the "Governor and Company," and relentlessly preyed on their fears as to the continuance of their monopoly, it is pleasant to read of the intense feeling of loyalty which actuated the directors in all their dealings with the State. When, after the Rebellion of 1715, the Government proposed to reduce the interest on the National Debt from six to five per cent., the Bank testified to their desire to assist the measure by at once agreeing to accept the lower rate, and to provide money to pay off those creditors who declined to submit to the reduction. Again, when a further reduction in the interest on part of the National Debt was proposed in 1750, the Bank at once assented, and arranged to find a sum of money to pay off the dissentients. The passive attitude lately assumed by the Bank directors towards the conversion scheme of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer contrasts somewhat unfavourably with the loyal attachment of the Bank to the State in olden times. The transactions of the Bank of England with Government for a period of one hundred

and twenty years ending with 1816 are but a series of loans and advances by the Bank in anticipation of the revenue, or of payments of treasury bills drawn by the Government agents abroad. These large advances and payments were entirely independent of the permanent loan made to the Government by the Bank, and were supposed to be but temporary assistance rendered to the State in times of sore need, to be repaid periodically as the revenue was collected. But repayment was not made. Again and again did the Governor and Company represent to the Ministers that they were unable to continue to increase the floating debt without endangering the safety of the Bank. Coaxed and bullied in turn (especially by Pitt), they allowed their loyalty to outrun their prudence, and yielded more or less gracefully time after time, till at last in 1797 they were compelled to suspend cash payments, entirely through their exertions to aid the Government. Undoubtedly the exclusive privileges which the Bank in the infancy of banking enjoyed were in some sense a *quid pro quo* for their services to the State, and the fear of losing their charter may have been a strong incentive to loyalty. The subsequent gradual enfranchisement of banking by the various enactments between 1826 and 1858 and the enormous progress which banking has since made throughout the country, have, however, considerably lessened the value of these privileges, and from a mere proprietor's point of view it is quite possible that the Bank of England might profitably forego their charter altogether, now that they are in no fear of losing it, and, so far as pure banking is concerned, they no longer enjoy a monopoly. These considerations may have tempered the loyalty of the directors, and may account for the very independent fashion in which they nowadays approach the Government for the transaction of business upon which, in the olden time, they were accustomed to enter with fear and trembling.

The establishment of branches by the Bank of England in 1826 was a direct consequence of the great panic of 1825, caused, as the Government alleged, by reckless speculation encouraged and fostered by private banks, and by the over-issue of country bank notes. In a correspondence with the Bank, the Government expressed their determination to "improve the circulation of the country paper," and, after paying the Bank the compliment of saying, "We believe that much of the prosperity of the country is to be attributed to the general wisdom, justice, and fairness of the dealings of the Bank," suggested that the Bank of England should establish branches of their own in different parts of the country, and should, moreover, yield part of their exclusive privilege of joint-stock banking by permitting the formation of banks with more than six partners, except in or within sixty-five miles of the metropolis. After a vain attempt to obtain some compensation for the concession of their monopoly for joint-stock banking the Bank yielded on both points,

and an Act was passed authorising the establishment of Bank of England branches and the formation of country joint-stock banks. The circulation of one and two pound notes was also prohibited by this Act.

The Bank charter was again renewed in 1833, when Bank of England notes were first made a legal tender, and the usury laws repealed so far as they affected three months' bills. The most important clause in this charter, however, was that which legalised the establishment of joint-stock banks in and within sixty-five miles of London. This led to the establishment of the London and Westminster Bank in 1834, the first of those numerous metropolitan joint-stock banks which now so extensively and beneficially administer to the commercial wants of the country. Up to about this time it had been universally considered that the Bank of England enjoyed the exclusive privilege of joint-stock banking within the above radius, but now the astonishing discovery was made that this was not so, and in fact never had been so; and this discovery was confirmed by the law officers of the Crown. The directors protested, but resistance was useless. The Bank lost its supposed privilege, though it is very questionable whether the Government behaved quite straightforwardly in the matter. This Act, together with one or two subsequent banking Acts, thus completely enfranchised banking, and abolished a monopoly which was, after all, obstructive both to financial and commercial progress. The abolishment of any monopoly is invariably but a question of education and time, and, in accordance with the doctrine of experience, it does not appear that the Bank have really lost anything by the competition engendered by the enfranchisement of joint-stock banking, while commerce and the community have undoubtedly gained enormously.

We come now to Sir Robert Peel's famous Bank Charter Act of 1844, entitled "An Act to regulate the issue of Bank Notes, and for giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England certain privileges for a limited period." It confirms the curtailed privileges of the Bank for eleven years, subject afterwards to redemption on twelve months' notice being given and the repayment of the debt due by the Government to the Bank. A clause in the subsequent National Debt Act of 1870, however, provides that the Bank of England shall continue to be a corporation until all the public Funds shall be redeemed by Parliament, thus practically granting it a lease in perpetuity. The Act of 1844—to some of the special provisions of which I shall presently refer—practically regulates the whole banking system of the country, and at the present time governs the Bank of England in the conduct of their business. In accordance with its provisions, the issue of Bank of England notes was first kept distinct from the banking business proper by the creation of the "Issue Department" and the "Banking Department," with which probably

most of my readers are perfectly familiar, at least by name. Besides these Issue and Banking Departments, there is in the Bank a third most important department, devoted to what is generally, though somewhat inaccurately, termed "the management of the National Debt." In their capacity of bankers to the State the governor and company of the Bank of England have always acted as the financial agents of the Government for distributing, and paying the dividends on, the funded debt, as well as for the performance of other book-keeping duties in connection therewith. Of late years the Bank have undertaken similar duties for the Indian and several Colonial Governments, for the Metropolitan Board of Works, and for various corporations and municipalities. The considerable portion of the Bank premises devoted to this agency business is now generally spoken of by financial and banking writers as "The Department for the Management of the National Debt"—an imposing title doubtless, which says a good deal more than it means, and one, for aught I know, adopted nowadays by the Bank themselves; but, possibly influenced by the recollections of days long gone by, I confess my partiality for the old familiar title of "Stock Offices."

In the conduct of their business, then, the Bank of England perform three distinct and important functions—that of financial agents, that of issuers of notes under the control of the State, and that of Government and general bankers. The duties involved in these functions are discharged, severally, towards the State and the various governments and corporations for whom they are agents; towards the general public, from or to whom they buy or sell notes and gold; and towards the Government and customers for whom they act as ordinary bankers. I will consider briefly the system by which these three functions are discharged. The offices comprised in the department for the management of the National Debt are the various stock offices in which are kept the stock ledgers and the transfer books, the Dividend Office, the Cheque Office, the Unclaimed Dividend Office, the Power of Attorney Office, and the Will or Register Office. The nature of the business transacted in these different offices is sufficiently indicated by their names, with the exception of the Cheque Office, which, on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, is probably so called because it has nothing whatever to do with "cheques," but is devoted, for the most part, to the purpose of checking the amounts and totals of the dividend warrants paid by the "Dividend Pay Office," an office which belongs to the Banking Department. Some idea of the amount of work done in the various Stock Offices may be gathered from the circumstance that they employ the services of some 450 clerks. Nearly 2,000 books are in constant use in some ten or twelve rooms. The dividend warrants on the funded debt alone number about half a million a year, and are, when paid, sent to Somerset House for verification, together with a duplicate copy of the dividend book. As remuneration for its

services in connection with the National Debt, the Bank is paid a commission of £300 per million on the first six hundred millions of the amount and £150 per million on the remainder. Since the funded debt is now altogether about £628,500,000, the Bank receives on this account about £184,000 per annum, a remuneration which cannot be considered excessive.

The extreme accuracy and dispatch with which the clerical labour involved in the business of the Stock Offices is performed is almost marvellous, and reflects the highest credit on the administrative machinery of the Bank. Every possible expedient is resorted to for the purpose of facilitating the work and guarding against error, even to the free employment of the Bank's printing-office and the use of the stereotype process in the preparation of the dividend books in duplicate. It is worth mentioning that all the old stock ledgers, transfer books, vouchers, and documents connected with the various stocks which have been created since the establishment of the Bank are carefully preserved and systematically arranged for ready reference in the Stock Office library under the charge of a librarian, whose duties, however, though involving great responsibility, are more monotonous than onerous.

The "Issue Department" of the Bank of England is the outcome of the determination expressed by the Government in 1844 "to regulate the issue of bank notes." The experience of former years, more particularly that of 1825, had fully demonstrated how undesirable, and even dangerous, it was to leave the circulation of bank notes to the uncontrolled discretion of country bankers, and though there can be no reason to doubt that the Bank of England had hitherto used the power which they possessed of expanding or contracting their circulation at will with great judgment, and substantially to the benefit of the mercantile community, it was thought desirable that the control of the whole circulation in the country should be practically vested in the State, and be governed by some sound financial principle. The theoretical basis of the Act of 1844 is the principle that bank notes should not be mere symbols of credit—simple I O U's, as it were, which are a confession of a want of cash—but of actual "ear-marked" gold; of ready money, which alone regulates, or should regulate, the extent of the commerce of the country. The soundness of this principle is doubted by many financial authorities on the ground that it checks the proper expansion of trade and in times of crisis has failed in practice. I cannot, however, here discuss the large subject of currency, but must accept the law as I find it, merely stating that in my opinion it affords the only safe basis upon which any sound currency can be regulated. To carry out this law effectually, then, it was obviously necessary that the Government should create or select some establishment from which bank notes might be issued, and in which the gold that

these notes represented should be set apart or stored. As the State Bank, the Bank of England was naturally entrusted with these functions. Hence the creation of the "Issue Department." But in order to afford some elasticity to the circulation, and to deal gently with the "vested interests" of the Bank of England and country bankers alike, the Act provides that no banks of issue shall be permitted other than those in existence in May, 1844, and that an average of the note circulation of these banks shall be taken, which shall in future be the maximum circulation allowed to them. This maximum was subsequently fixed at about eight and three-quarter millions. Provisions are also made by which, on certain terms, issuing banks may cede their privilege of issue to the Bank or forfeit them altogether in case of bankruptcy or certain changes in the constitution of their partnerships. The total amount of these "lapsed issues" since 1844 is about two and three-quarter millions, leaving the present authorised maximum circulation of the country banks at about six millions. No stipulation is made that any proportion of this circulation shall be based upon gold. This matter is left entirely to the judgment of the bankers themselves, whose discretion, however, there seems no reason to question, since from the weekly returns supplied to the Government in conformity with the Act it appears that not more than one-half the notes of the maximum issue are in actual circulation. With regard to the Bank of England, permission is accorded to the Issue Department to issue notes to the amount of fourteen millions upon securities—including the £11,015,100 due by the Government to the Bank—to be set apart for the purpose of guarantee. The Bank is furthermore permitted to increase the amount of notes issued on securities to the extent of two-thirds of the lapsed issues of country banks. The extra issue thus acquired is now £1,750,000, which brings up the total amount of issue on securities to £15,750,000, inclusive of the Government debt. Any further issue of notes must be represented by an equal amount of bullion or gold coin transferred to the separate vaults of the Issue Department, but one-fourth of the amount so transferred may consist of silver bullion.

The Bank are required to furnish the Government with a weekly report of the accounts of the Issue and Banking departments. This report, which is popularly called "The Bank Return," is published each Thursday afternoon, and is copied in the morning newspapers of Friday, together with the comments and deductions, more or less speculative and intelligent, of the different City editors. The Bank Return, so far as it regards the Issue department, is simplicity itself. Let the reader put one of them before him. On the one side he will find the total amount of notes issued, and on the other the bases of the issue, divided into the "Government debt," the "other securities" (which together make up the total of £15,750,000, above mentioned), "gold coin and bullion," and "silver bullion," if there be any,

which is very seldom the case. The simple term "bullion" signifies gold bullion, or gold in bars, which the Bank are compelled to receive from any person tendering it, in exchange for notes, at the rate of £3 17s. 9d. per ounce of 22 parts out of 24 of pure gold.

It is evident that the amount of bank notes issued varies in exact proportion to the amount of gold in the Issue Department, the issue against the Government debt and other securities being invariable. Roughly speaking, the contraction or expansion of the circulation indicates a corresponding curtailment or increase in commercial facilities or requirements. Hence the Issue Department return becomes an important guide to the operations of bankers, brokers, and financial firms, by whom it is carefully watched, since the increase or diminution of the stock of gold may be said respectively to be a signal of safety or danger. The receipts or withdrawals of gold in any large quantity by or from the Bank are of two kinds, inland and foreign. The former for the most part occur at certain regular periods of the year, such as the harvest season, Scotch "term-time," &c. They exercise but a very modified and temporary influence on the money market, for the laws by which they are governed are very fairly understood and recognised, and the amount of gold *actually in the kingdom* remains unaltered. It is far different, however, with the demand or supply of gold from foreign countries, the importance of which to the financial world is so great that the amount of gold received or delivered by the Bank on foreign account is by them made known day by day, and is duly chronicled in the City articles of the morning papers. The exports and imports of gold (which practically, regulate the note issue) are governed by the state of the foreign exchanges, which are probably a mystery to many of my readers, but which up to a certain point may be readily understood. Approaching the subject as tenderly and in as elementary a manner as possible, I will at once simplify matters by saying that, with a few exceptions (such as regard India, Russia, China, &c.), the foreign rates of exchange represent the amount of money in its own currency (be it paper or gold) that the specified financial centre of each country is willing to give for a pound sterling on London. They vary almost daily, and are indications either of indebtedness or of the abundance or scarcity of money, and are described as favourable or unfavourable to this country according to whether they are high or low. A rate of exchange is an indication of indebtedness, according to the position of the balance of trade or indebtedness between the country fixing it and England. When in any given country this indebtedness is in favour of England, it is obvious that in that country bills on London for the purpose of remittance will be in demand, and will fetch more money; consequently the rate at which they will be purchased rises. When the balance of trade is against England, it is equally evident that bills on London are not so much wanted, and the price of them—that is the rate of exchange—consequently falls.



But I have said that a rate of exchange may be an indication of abundance or scarcity of money in the country quoting it; and it is often so in this manner. Let us suppose that there is no balance of trade to settle between a given country and England, but that the rate, of discount, or value of money, in the former is, say, three per cent., while in England it is, say, four per cent. It follows that *prima facie* it is more profitable to send surplus money to England for employment than to keep it at home. In the absence of trade bills a demand for drafts transferring money to London sets in, and the rate of exchange rises. Let us now reverse this condition of things. Suppose money to be dearer in a given country than in England; it is evident in that case that capitalists here would find it more profitable to employ their money in that country than at home, and that the foreign rate of exchange would consequently fall. I have spoken hitherto of remittances by bills or drafts only, but it is obvious that a scarcity of these vehicles for the transfer of money may so drive up the rate of exchange that it becomes more profitable to send gold. When this point is reached the foreign rate of exchange is said to stand at "gold point." If I have made myself clearly understood, the reader will now see how the rate of discount by attracting or repelling money affects the movement of gold in the Bank of England, and why, when the Bank desire to either simply protect their stock of gold or their "reserve," and so prevent any contraction of the note issue, or to attract gold from abroad and so expand the circulation, or increase the "reserve," they raise the official rate of discount step by step until the desired end is accomplished; or why, when the stock of gold is large and the note issue may with safety be contracted, they facilitate the trade of the country by lowering their minimum rate, at the risk of gold being required for export. He will, too, gain some slight idea of how the world's stock of gold is moved about from country to country at the call of commerce, and how true it is that the trade of any country is, or ought to be, regulated solely by its supply of gold, or ready money.

The offices comprised in the Issue Department of the Bank are the Hall, the Bullion Office, and the Gold-weighing Room. In the Hall, notes and gold are exchanged by the public one for the other, and notes are exchanged for other notes of a higher or lower denomination. In the Bullion Office bar-gold is bought at the rate of £3 17s. 9d. per ounce, or exchanged for sovereigns at the rate of £3 17s. 10½d. per ounce, at which rate bullion is also sold. Nearly all the imports of gold and silver to this country are taken to the Bank of England for delivery to the consignees. The duties connected with these consignments are undertaken by the Bullion Office, where small charges are made for weighing, packing, and collecting freight; &c. In the Gold-weighing Room gold coin is weighed automatically, at the rate of about 2,000 pieces an hour each, by about a dozen beautiful little machines worked by an atmospheric engine.

Bank notes are not re-issued after having been once paid, and in the Bank Note Office registers are kept in which are recorded the dates of issue and return to the Bank of each respective note. The particulars of the payment of any note can be ascertained by a reference to the Bank Note Library, where the paid and cancelled notes are kept for seven years, after which they are burnt on the Bank premises. For the privilege of issuing the £15,750,000 against securities, and for exemption from stamp duty, the Bank pay an annual sum of about £200,000, together with any profit which they may derive from the notes issued against gold to the Government. The paper on which bank notes are printed is manufactured expressly for the Bank of England at Laverstock in Hampshire, but the dies from which the water-mark is made, as well as the plates from which the notes are printed, are made at the Bank. The notes are all printed at the Bank's own printing-office under the care of the printing superintendent, the quantity of notes required from time to time being regulated by the chief cashier, who is responsible for their safe custody as soon as, by a second process of printing, the numbers and dates have been filled in for the purpose of issue. The average number of bank notes paid and cancelled each day is more than 40,000, and no less than 80,000,000 cancelled notes may be found as a rule, stored and sorted for reference, in the Bank Note Library. The Bank of England also undertakes the printing of "rupee paper" for the Indian Government.

The "Banking Department" of the Bank of England is the separation of the ordinary banking business from the business of financial agency and issuing notes. In a speech on the renewal of the Bank charter in 1844 Sir Robert Peel said, "With respect to the banking business of the Bank, I propose that it should be governed on precisely the same principles as would regulate any other body dealing with Bank of England notes." The Bank Act of 1844, then, does not touch the management of the Banking Department in any way beyond requiring that a weekly statement of its assets and liabilities shall be published. This statement—which forms part of the "Bank Return"—may be thus analysed. On the left hand side are the liabilities, divided into the liability towards the proprietors of the Bank as shown by the amounts of "Proprietors' Capital" and "Rest" (which latter is practically an addition to the capital); the liability to the Government, as shown by the amount of "Public Deposits," which are the balances of different Government accounts; the liability to the customers as shown by the amount of the "Other Deposits," which are the sum of the balances of the current or "drawing" accounts; and the liability to the holders of the Bank's acceptances as shown by the amount of "Seven-day and other Bills" in circulation. On the other side of the statement are the assets by which these liabilities are represented, divided into "Government Securities," which show the amount of the banking capital invested in Government securities; the "Other Securities,"

which show the amount of other investments made by the Bank ; and, separately, the " notes " and " gold and silver coin," which show the amount of cash in hand for the current purposes of the Banking Department. This sum of notes and gold and silver coin forms, so to speak, the cash assets of the Bank, and the proportion which it bears to the current liabilities disclosed by the public and other deposits and seven-day bills is called the proportion of reserve to liabilities, and is always a matter of great interest, and often of great anxiety, to the City on Thursdays.

The question of the proportion which these cash assets should bear to liabilities is one of extreme importance to a prudent banker. It is generally considered that it should be about one-third, but a proportion of reserve to liabilities of only 33 per cent. in the Bank Return would create considerable anxiety, while in an ordinary joint-stock bank's accounts it would, I fancy, be abnormally great, far greater than that disclosed by the half-yearly accounts submitted to the shareholders, which may naturally be supposed to represent the financial position in the most favourable light. The publication of the weekly Bank Return is so useful and important to commerce, banking, and finance that it is to be regretted that the law which calls for it is not extended to all joint-stock if not to private banks. We might then hope to see an end put to that faulty system of banking which in good times, in order to pay extraordinary dividends, encourages over-trading by giving every possible facility to speculation, and, when a reaction comes, suddenly cuts off all " accommodation," calls in all resources, and drives its customers to the Bank of England, in the hope of obtaining that ready money which it is no longer willing itself to supply. The Bank of England, through their Banking Department, undertake duties merely towards their own customers and the Government. Their banking business is conducted for the most part (in theory, at all events) on the same lines as any other banking institution. It is unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that it is any part of their duty, in times of panic or crisis, to find ready money for a public shunted over to them by its own bankers, who from an inordinate desire to pay large dividends have placed themselves in a position of inability or unwillingness to find it themselves. And yet some such theory as this is advanced by many well-known writers on banking and finance. Bankers, probably knowing the weak points in their system, become sadly selfish, and are quick to take fright at the first signs of a panic, which they often do much to increase. The suspension of the Bank Act is to them the only true solution of the difficulties caused by over-trading, over-speculation, and inflation of general business. At their earnest entreaty—not at the solicitation of the Bank of England—has the Act been thrice suspended; not, as subsequent events proved, because any suspension of the Act was really necessary, but because bankers hesitated to do their duty to their customers, except under the shelter of its protecting wing. Nothing can be

more erroneous, or, indeed, more mischievous, than the doctrine that it is the duty of the Bank of England to keep the "reserve" of the whole country, simply on the ground that, for Clearing House purposes, it suits the convenience of bankers to entrust them with large balances, and because they act as agents for the Government in automatically regulating the note issue of the kingdom.

The business of the Banking Department—which, except as regards the magnitude of its transactions, and the current accounts of other bankers and of the Government, differs but little from that of any other London banks—is carried on chiefly in the Private Drawing Office, the Public Drawing Office, the Discount Office, and the Bill and Post Bill Offices. Besides these offices there are the Dividend Pay Office, devoted to the cash payment of dividends, and the Chief Cashier's Office, where advances on securities and the various public loans are initiated, and to which is attached the private room of the chief cashier, which for the most part corresponds with the manager's room in any ordinary bank. In the Private Drawing Office are kept the private accounts of the general customers of the Bank, a separate counter being reserved for the exclusive convenience of bankers. It is a popular error to suppose that the conditions of keeping an account with the Bank of England differ in any essential particular from those of most of the other banks. A satisfactory introduction will enable any one to open an account, and no restriction is placed upon the amount of balance to be kept, except that if it does not prove remunerative to the Bank a charge is made in proportion to the amount of trouble and expense involved. Roughly speaking, a remunerative balance in ordinary cases is considered to be an average balance throughout the year of one pound for each cheque drawn. Thus if a customer draws two hundred cheques in a year and keeps an average balance of £200 his account is probably considered remunerative. Cheques may be drawn on the Bank of any amount however small, though there was, I believe, many years ago, a sort of understanding that customers should not draw cheques for an amount under five pounds. The Public Drawing Office, as its name implies, is devoted to the custody of the drawing accounts of the Government and various public companies and institutions. The Discount Office is charged with the reception of all bills offered for discount by parties who have opened discount accounts with the Bank. These bills are submitted to a committee of directors (sitting daily for the purpose) who decide upon the amount of accommodation to be granted and the rate of discount to be charged. The net proceeds of the bills discounted are then passed to the credit of the customer's account, while the bills themselves are entrusted to the care of the Bill Office, which occupies itself with the duty of sorting and arranging them (together with bills belonging to customers) so that they may be duly presented for payment at maturity. In the Post Bill Office the Bank issue to the public their

acceptances at seven or sixty days' sight, technically called "Bank post bills," for any required amount, in even or uneven sums. The amount of business transacted in this office has considerably diminished of late years, owing to similar facilities being granted by bankers generally throughout the country. The Bank of England have nine country branches, which keep separate accounts for the Issue and Banking departments, and the particulars of each day's transactions, together with the balance sheets, are posted nightly to the Branch Banks Office in London, through which office all the correspondence and business transactions connected with the branches are carried on. There is also one branch in London at the West-End.

The economy of the Bank of England is controlled by the Governor, the Deputy-Governor, and twenty-four Directors. The clerical machinery is divided into the "Cash side" and the "Accountant's side." The former, under the practical charge of the chief cashier, comprises the transaction of all business where actual cash is concerned, together with the necessary book-keeping which it involves; the latter, under the charge of the chief accountant, takes cognizance of all matters of pure book-keeping where no actual cash is concerned, such as those which relate to the National Debt accounts, the registration of Bank notes, and so on. In olden times these divisions were kept much more distinct than they are at present. There was formerly a certain antagonism between the two "chiefs" which, however, has long since disappeared, and they now live together in a state of remarkable harmony, without even fighting over the question of precedence which the chief accountant is supposed to claim—mainly, I fancy, on alphabetical grounds, because A comes before C. The supervision of each office on both "sides" of the Bank, is intrusted to a principal and deputy-principal, who are accountable in the first place to the chief cashier or chief accountant, as the case may be, and afterwards to a committee of directors. The secretary is a separate officer of the Bank. He stands midway, as it were, between the two "sides," having certain relations with each. He nurses the charter, and sees that its forms and ceremonies are complied with; he records the proceedings of the courts, summons and attends all committees, and "picks up their bits." He waits upon the governors, and does odd literary jobs, stops notes, puts the candidates for clerkship through their preliminary examination, collects income-tax, and grants orders to view the Bank, &c. His duties, in short, are as multifarious as those of the General Post Office, and it is satisfactory to think that they are as equally well performed by the present incumbent and his staff.

The total number of employes all told in the Bank is about 1,100, and the salary list, including pensions, is about £300,000 per annum. There is an excellent library and reading-room in the Bank, to which the directors have liberally contributed both money and books. There are also a Widows' Fund and Guarantee Society, a Life Insurance Company, a Volunteer Company, and a Club, or dining

room, where clerks can dine cheaply and well, connected with the Bank, which owe very much of their prosperity to the liberality and kind consideration of the directors. The governors and directors of the Bank divide between them £14,000 per annum. Of this the governors receive £1,000 each and the directors £500 each. Beyond the status which their position gives them, they derive no benefit from their office, while they tax themselves most liberally by their contributions towards the welfare of their clerks. The governor and deputy-governor remain in office for two years only, and this short tenure of office is, with considerable reason, thought to be detrimental to the efficient and consistent administration of the functions of government. The great blot of the system seems to be the want of continuity of policy which is engendered. A governor, let us say, is an enlightened financier; for two years his policy is paramount; but his successor then comes, and perhaps reverses everything, and the onus of the change, so far as the Bank customers are concerned, is left to be borne by the permanent officers of the Bank, who have perhaps never been consulted in the matter, or whose opinions, based on the experience of many years, may be ruthlessly ignored. The two years' system undoubtedly has its advantages in the constant introduction of new blood, it also strengthens the governors from above and below the chair. The directors below the chair give the governor a loyal and hearty support, because they feel that one day their own turn may come, while those above the chair, having passed through the ordeal, know the value of their colleagues' support. But the result of this is nevertheless the institution of a sort of one-man power, which is well enough when there is a Hubbard, Hodgson, or Crawford in the chair, or if there is a Baring, Hambro, Rothschild, or Goschen to follow, but which may have its disadvantages.

I have thus traced the rise, sketched the progress, and dwelt briefly on the present position of the Bank of England. In spite of the gradual abolition of their monopoly, in spite of the curtailment of their exclusive privileges, and in spite of all consequent competition, the "governor and company" have never failed to lead the van of the banking progress of the kingdom, and to maintain their proud position as the first banking institution in the world. Bill-brokers may occasionally grumble at the late revival of an old rule restricting the periods of advances to six weeks before dividend time, and customers may occasionally smile or fume at the traces of red-tapeism which still linger in the establishment; but no one can look back, as I do, over a period of forty years, without fully appreciating the value of the important and beneficial changes and improvements which have lately been effected in every department of the Bank for the purpose of facilitating the transaction of business and studying the convenience of the public, or without feeling an increased veneration and respect for "the old lady in Threadneedle Street."

HENRY MAY.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE lamentable events of the last few weeks in the Soudan have exercised an influence at once paralyzing and confusing upon the councils of the Opposition, and the terrible uncertainty of the position of affairs in the Soudan is reflected in the vacillation of the Conservative leaders not less than in the perplexity of the Government. The fall of Khartoum, the death of Gordon, the check which our troops have received in their original advance, the necessity of recasting the entire plan of the campaign, and the commencement of a new expedition, are circumstances which testify with an eloquence only too tragic to the absolute miscarriage of the first plans of the Cabinet. Two months ago we were engaged in an attempt for which it seemed reasonable to anticipate a speedy and a prosperous issue; now, at an immense cost, we are committed to the enterprise of retrieving a failure. True, our arms have sustained no defeat; but it is plain that we have not reckoned accurately with our adversary, and that those who indulged the hope of smashing the Mahdi by a *coup de main* were the victims of a delusion. No Ministers could be proof against the shocks to their influence and prestige which Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues have experienced. Nor is it only in Egypt and the Soudan that the prospect is obscured. The reports which have alarmed the public mind of the Russian advance must be heavily discounted before they can be accepted. Still, when all deductions on the score of wilful and interested exaggeration are made, the relations between England and Russia on the Afghan frontier are, to say the least, unwelcome and critical. England's pre-occupations are Russia's opportunity, and it is difficult to banish the sinister recollection that it was at a time of European commotion that Russia pressed, thirteen years ago, for the revision of the Black Sea Treaty. If our colonial difficulties with Germany are less acute than was the case six weeks ago, Prince Bismarck has exhibited no perceptible change in his attitude towards this country. As a matter of fact, and as was explained in the last number of this Review, there was no reason to expect that he would do so. The German Chancellor has always before him the disappearance of his Emperor. He knows that when this event takes place he will be confronted by personal influences in high quarters directly antagonistic to his own policy, and that unless the relations between England and Germany are then in a state of considerable tension, the Fatherland will gravitate in the direction of a Western alliance. The key-note of his carefully elaborated scheme of diplomatic action is the establishment of an *entente cordiale* between the two German empires and Russia. It is, therefore, his business to multiply the obstacles in the path of a *rapprochement*

between Germany and England or Germany and France. That object he is now systematically prosecuting. In proportion as he achieves, or is in a fair way to achieve it, the position of England will be for the time more difficult, and English Ministers will be exposed to partisan and popular obloquy.

The Conservatives are, as we write, endeavouring to make, quite legitimately, what capital they can out of these complications. They can cite against the Government the so-called isolation of England, although the bonds of amity that unite England and Italy have been drawn conspicuously closer during the past month. They can cite also the perils and the horrors of our operations in the Soudan, and the impracticability of the financial arrangement for Egypt which we have concluded, or all but concluded, with France. In a word, the case with which events have provided them against the Cabinet is as strong as the bitterest enemy of Mr. Gladstone could desire. While a great party conflict is raging in the House of Commons, and on the eve of beginning, with a result that is a foregone conclusion, in the House of Lords, it will be more profitable to examine briefly the precise position of the minority, which desires to turn itself into a majority, than to summarize well-worn arguments or to retell a more than twice-told tale. Much has been said and written during the last few months on the excellence of the qualities which Lord Salisbury has revealed in the capacity of a party leader and a political tactician. Let us look at the facts—facts which, as we have freely allowed, are sufficiently detrimental to the Government. We know that the vote of censure which Lord Salisbury, in terms somewhat more peremptory and stirring than those adopted by Sir Stafford Northcote, has brought forward in the House of Lords will be carried by a handsome majority. It is scarcely rash to say that the vote of censure in the House of Commons will be defeated by a majority which, if not handsome, is at least sufficient. Upon this assumption, Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote will have gained absolutely nothing by the hostile demonstrations of the present week. If, therefore, it is the object of a political leader to win and not to lose, to expel his enemies from office and not temporarily to confirm them in office, it follows that the Tory leader has placed another failure on record. The truth is, that the Conservatives are now doing, with the moral certainty of getting nothing by it, what they might have done, had they acted differently during last autumn, with the moral certainty of gaining everything. It is no vindication of Lord Salisbury to say that, had he acted at his own initiative and upon his own judgment, matters would have been different. The political critic can only estimate the sagacity of the political leader by reference to what he does, and not by what he might have desired to do. If the wiser and more courageous counsels of Lord Salisbury were overborne by others, that only shows him to lack the courage



which his convictions should inspire—in other words, to be deficient in the qualities which a leader of men ought to possess. Lord Salisbury's apologists are thus his severest critics; and the more closely we examine both what he has done and what he has failed to do, the more apparent is it that he has missed an opportunity which seldom falls to the lot of the leader of an Opposition.

The ground which the Tory chief took up a year ago was perfectly intelligible. He was not, he said, an irreconcilable opponent of household franchise in counties, but he maintained that, before this franchise was conferred, the country should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject, and of seeing the proposed scheme of parliamentary reform in its integrity. Had he adhered to that resolution, had he persevered in fighting boldly and fairly the battle of the franchise, how impregnable the position that he would now have occupied! It may be said that Lord Salisbury, directly he saw that there was some danger of a formidable agitation against the Upper House, had no alternative but to come to terms with Mr. Gladstone. To explain, however, is not to vindicate, and if Lord Salisbury possessed the political prescience with which he is sometimes credited, and without which there can be no real statesmanship, would he not have determined to run the risk and wait for the events which have since developed themselves? Moreover, the Conservatives consistently declined to believe in the reality of the demand for the Franchise Bill, or in the genuineness of the popular disapproval of the action of the House of Lords in rejecting it. Either these professions were true or false. If they were true, why were they ever abandoned? and what Conservative can doubt that if they had been maintained the Tory party would have had just reason to congratulate itself now? Lord Salisbury, it is said, only wants the occasion to distinguish himself as a great Foreign Minister. Surely, then, he ought to have perceived in the summer of 1884 that under the régime of Mr. Gladstone all our foreign policy was going hopelessly wrong and that the Liberal blunders in that department, co-operating with the chapter of accidents on the banks of the Nile, would, a little time hence, have placed him in the possession of an indictment which could be preferred with irresistible and unanswerable cogency against the Liberal Cabinet. Only imagine how he and his party would have been situated to-day. 'The Franchise Bill would not have become law. The Redistribution Bill would not have been as good as law. The appeal would have lain to the old constituencies, and the Parliament elected in 1880 would have been pronounced as not less effete and impotent than it now is. A vote of censure based upon the incapacity of Ministers must have been certainly carried in the House of Commons by a substantial, possibly an overwhelming majority. A dissolution would have ensued, and the chances are that, with the landlords and the farmers combined against the Liberals, and

with the dissatisfaction existing against the Government in many of the small boroughs, the Conservatives would have been returned to power. In that case the same task as was placed upon them in 1867 would have devolved upon them once more. They would have dealt with the county franchise and the redistribution of seats, if not precisely on their own terms, yet in their own manner. The period of Conservative ascendancy might not have been protracted, but that ascendancy would have been a fact.

What then is the policy of the Conservatives at the present moment, and what is their object in attacking the Government without the intention of overthrowing it? Why should they be, as we see them to-day, willing to wound and yet afraid to strike? The answer is obvious. If the Tories came before Parliament and the country as men who were willing, not only to turn their opponents out of office, but to assume office themselves, and, having achieved a triumph, to discharge its obligations, it is possible, some people may think it is probable, they would win. But that is just what they shrink from doing. They do not wish to win. They must do something, and so they are, in familiar parlance, riding for a fall. No one doubts that the result of the debate now taking place in the House of Commons must be, on the whole, to weaken and discredit the Government. The course of events in the Soudan may also have the same tendency. We are committed to a costly, a prolonged, and, however assured ultimate victory may be, a deadly campaign. The climate of a Soudan summer must work hideously lethal havoc among our soldiers. It is quite possible that before the enterprise is over the stock of national patience may be exhausted, and though no fresh errors may have been committed, the country will show symptoms of a disposition to rise against the Cabinet. In all probability the general election will take place next November, and the Conservatives calculate that the Soudan campaign will then give them a chance in appealing to the new constituencies, which without such assistance they could not have had. This does not seem a very noble or patriotic forecast. It has yet to be proved that it will be justified by the result. The English people are subject, quite as much as any of their continental neighbours, to the emotional vicissitudes of enthusiasm and indignation. They have, however, a strong sense of justice and an innate love of fair play.

It is of course possible that, while the Government hold their own on the division challenged by Sir Stafford Northcote, they may be defeated upon some other issue, and that their places may be taken by the Opposition. The Conservatives in that case will scarcely be to be congratulated on their triumph, and when the general election comes, as come it inevitably will, towards the fall of the present year, the Liberals may anticipate their return to power under circumstances greatly improved. The crisis of the Soudan campaign will,

we may hope, have been surmounted, and the country will have expressed an opinion upon it. The new voters will also have had some experience of the aptitude of the Conservatives for conducting the business of the nation. That this is the prospect for the realisation of which Mr. Gladstone must devoutly pray it needs no argument to prove. But it is almost too much to hope for. The assertion that a change of Government is the one thing desired by the country is persevered in by the London newspapers, but so far as the country itself is concerned all the available evidence seems to show that, if this opinion has any real existence, it is limited to the regions about Fleet Street and Pall Mall.

Would a change of Government mean a change of policy? and do there now exist specific reasons why the English people should desire to replace a Liberal by a Conservative administration? The gravamen of the charge made against the Government by the Opposition is that their mismanagement of affairs in the past renders it impossible, or absurd, to trust them in the future; that their sins already committed are so unpardonable as to rob them of any *locus penitentie*; and that they are now engaging in a struggle without any clear notion of the account to which they will turn the fruits of victory. These propositions are perfectly intelligible and reasonable; but is it only to Liberal administrations that they could be applied? Have the Conservatives a clear record in regard to Egypt? Are they prepared with a full and definite programme for the Soudan? and if not, why should they expect that the English people will transfer their confidence to them rather than amnesty Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues for the errors which are beyond recall. The Conservatives, it is at least certain, would do in the Soudan exactly what the Liberals are doing now. They would follow up hostilities against the Mahdi with all possible vigour, and they would make themselves indefinitely responsible for the administration of the vast and rainless desert, with its pestilential climate and illimitable distances. They would, in a word, attempt to accomplish what Gordon himself persistently alleged to be out of the question. Again, what military or patriotic duty of the hour is there which the Government are neglecting? No one accuses them of feebleness or timidity in grappling with militant Islam; the severest censure on them is that they have not decided what to do after that force is vanquished. But is any such decision practicable at the present moment? *Inter arma silent leges*, and it is truly preposterous to demand that the Government should introduce amid the din of arms a legislative scheme for the civil administration of the inhospitable desert at present filled with the Mahdi's fame. This is a question for Lord Wolseley to settle when the battle has been fought and won in conjunction with the authorities at home, and we may hope, and indeed feel tolerably sure, after Mr. Gladstone's speech on Monday, February 23, that

in the solution of it he will profit by the lesson which he learned in Zululand.

At the same time, it may be admitted that those who are in favour of speedy withdrawal from the Soudan and a cessation of hostilities against the Mahdi are not without strong argument on their side. Indeed, if we come to hard facts, it is difficult to adduce any positive and substantial reasons why the campaign should be persevered with on its present lines. We are to smash the Mahdi, not that we may occupy his territory or supplant him in the authority he exercises over the savage tribesmen of the desert, but because he threatens Egypt with a twofold danger: one that of a military invasion; the second that of an irruption of fanatical enthusiasm which may lead to disaster or massacre on the Nile, and spread its contagion to our Indian empire. Of these arguments the former may be called practical, the latter sentimental. But if it is the peace of Cairo or Alexandria which is threatened by the false prophet, and if it is the Egyptian frontier which is in danger, why, instead of fighting the Mahdi on his own ground, where everything is in his favour, and where nature herself is arrayed against Europeans, should we not fight him on ground that is more nearly our own, or at least not so untenable by us? Why should we not compel him to perform the difficult labour of mobilizing his scattered forces, and test his strength by challenging him to convey his troops to Egypt proper? Why, if it is the Egyptian frontier for which we are anxious, should we not concentrate our force upon Wady Halfa or any other spot that may be deemed vulnerable or convenient. It may be replied that more advanced outposts than those are required against the aggressive power of Mussulman fanaticism, and that the possession of a few isolated strongholds, as the experience of the Red Sea littoral conclusively shows, is calculated rather to produce an irritating friction than to establish an enduring bulwark against the advancing tide. But suppose that when all is said and done, it is found to be impossible to smash the Mahdi, or that as quickly as one of his hosts is demoralized another appears? A year ago it was thought that General Graham had smashed Osman Digna at Suakim; to-day Osman Digna is again threatening Suakim, and Graham is on his way to re-engage in the dangerous and costly task.

Of course it may be urged with much cogency that the risk of disturbance from the Mahomedan ascendancy and the growing fame of the Mahdi, resulting in riot and bloodshed both in Egypt and in India, is so serious that we cannot afford to expose ourselves to it, and that we must anticipate its possibility at any cost. Still, it has to be shown that the presence of an adequate number of English troops in Egypt could not do all that was necessary to reassure the native population, and to provide a safeguard against the outbreak of panic. Moreover, as regards India, the latest accounts of popular sentiment

contain nothing that is formidable—nothing that need make us apprehensive of the Mahdi's lighting up the flames of disaffection and war in any quarter of Hindostan. How far—such is the question which naturally suggests itself—ought we to act upon the principle, *venienti occurrere morbo*; and are we justified, as a precaution against a danger, at present only hypothetical, in India, in locking up an army in Africa?

Let us now pass to the north-west frontier of India itself. Over-estimating, probably, our embarrassments, the Russian Government have dispatched a special agent to London. His mission, if successful, would completely set aside the joint Boundary Commission, which Russia took a principal part in originating, although she has since left nothing undone to minimize its importance, and has been accompanied with the inevitable rumours of a Russian advance upon Herat. The selection of M. Lessar is significant. A Frenchman by birth, and an engineer in the Russian service, M. Lessar was nominated to General Zelenoy's staff because of his intimate acquaintance with Central Asia, much of which had been gained while surveying the route for a railway from the Caspian to Herat. No doubt this knowledge will be turned to good account in his negotiations with the Foreign Office during the absence of the English experts with Sir Peter Lunsden. The general object of M. Lessar's instructions is to claim the district between the Heri-Rud and Murghab rivers for Russia on geographical and ethnological grounds, conformably to the dictum of General Petroosevitch, that the capture of Merv would entail the incorporation of all Turcomania in the Czar's empire. As yet M. Lessar's representations have not had much effect, and he is awaiting further communications from his Government.

The tract in question, Badghees, is inhabited by a mixed population, and stretches down almost to within sight of Herat. Its possessor would have every opportunity for establishing influence in that city, and accordingly the most recent Russian policy has been directed to prepare the way for its annexation. Her officers have been working steadily down the Heri-Rud, where they have seized Pul-i-Khatun this summer, south of the original frontier-line proposed from Surukhs to the Oxus. They are also reported to have made a demonstration against the parallel point of Penjdeh on the Murghab, which is held by the Ameer's outposts. The last move in the game, which furnished the pretext for M. Lessar's mission, has been the acceptance of voluntary allegiance from some of the Selav Turcomans, who live in the east of the district, but whose camping-grounds probably take them up to Penjdeh. It is contended that this allegiance can only be rendered effective if Russian authority is made co-extensive with the migrations of the Selavs. On the other hand, if Her Majesty's Government are going to stand by their agreement with Abdurrahman Khan "to defend him against unprovoked aggres-

sion with men and money," a Russian advance upon Penjdeh must be considered as definitely passing the line south of which Russia cannot be allowed to press. Badghees is an integral part of the Ameer's dominions, and is controlled by his officers; there can be no complaint that the province is a lawless neighbourhood, for all accounts from Afghanistan show that, owing to the exhaustion of the clans and the consciousness of British support, the present Ameer has reduced the frontier tribes to an unusual state of discipline. Moreover, this aggression was anticipated at Cabul. In his correspondence with the Indian Governments, the Ameer explicitly mentions his apprehension of intrigues excited by Turcoman refugees in Badghees as necessary to a complete understanding of the terms of alliance.

It is difficult to penetrate the mask which Russia throws over her movements in Central Asia. There seems no doubt, however, that besides her advance on Pul-i-Khatun, troops and field artillery have been lately concentrated at Merv. The alarmist rumours, however, which prevailed immediately on M. Lessar's arrival have subsided. If this country adopts a vigorous attitude Russia is hardly likely to proceed to overt acts of hostility, though the indiscretion of her commanders may at any moment bring on a collision with the Ameer's troops. A consideration of the military position of the Russian and Indian Governments will at once show that England is at any rate better prepared for the initial stages of an Asian struggle. At the present moment the Anglo-Indian forces in the Quetta district, including the Thob Valley column, number at least 20,000 effective men with thirty-two guns, behind whom there are the 6,000 men of the Scinde garrison, and the possibility of hurrying up men from Kurraohce. It is very unlikely that the troops at General Komaroff's disposal are numerically stronger than the Quetta divisions. Moreover, though Askabad is nearly 140 miles nearer Herat than Quetta, it has no railway communication with the distant Caspian, while the Quetta railway is nearly finished, and will unite with the Indus lines.

The loyal offer of the Canadian and Australian colonists to aid the mother-country in Egypt with men and money has been received with enthusiasm by all classes. The moment was well chosen by the colonists, and the movement has unquestionably much political significance. It is proved to the world, in the most effectual manner, that England and her colonies, in spite of disputes and misunderstandings, are firmly united in aims and ideas. Australia was supposed to be smarting under a sense of neglect and official ill-treatment, but she has sunk all feelings of resentment in the presence of a common danger, and placed her military resources at England's disposal. The force at Suakim will be genuinely representative. Greater Britain as well as Great Britain will advance to Berber. The usual complaint in past times has been that colonists have been too slow to recognise the

cardinal doctrine that one of the essential conditions of the responsible institutions they enjoy is the power and ability to defend themselves. By their zeal and promptitude in offering voluntary assistance in an Imperial war begun by an Imperial Ministry, in which they have had no direct voice or representation, they have proved that they have passed the state of tutelage and nonage, and claim to be partners in the difficulties and dangers as well as the responsibilities, not simply of their own territories but of the Empire at large. The Colonial Council of Advice, as recommended by Earl Grey, was suspected by some to be an artful and elaborate political machine by means of which the colonists might put greater official pressure upon the Cabinet, and exact greater sacrifices of men and money from the parent State for purposes of their own aggrandisement. Such a narrow view of the functions of this Council and the intentions of the colonists has been completely dissipated by the burst of patriotism which has stirred Canada and Australia. The aid so freely and magnanimously proffered will be of no mean description. Should a colonial army corps of the various contingents be organized at Suakim, no fewer than two or three thousand men will co-operate with our regiments and the Indian contingent. With characteristic promptitude, New South Wales has offered to place her contingent of infantry and artillerymen at Suakim within thirty days. The *Independence Belge* sees in the movement a sign that Prince Bismarck's colonial enterprises have only ended in drawing closer the bonds between England and her colonies. His over-nice scrutiny of our colonial borders has deeply stirred the colonial spirit. However keenly the colonists have been vexed by the *laches* of the Colonial Office, they have still possessed enough of the ballast of patriotism to come forward and protest, in the most forcible way they could, against the isolation of England in Europe. There is, therefore, another recruiting ground for British forces outside the boundaries of the British islands, namely, in our numerous and rising settlements, and the world should take note of this fact.

It is precisely the ordeal of war and of its hardship, which was required to give solidity and strength to the feeling of Imperial unity which seemed as random as an unemployed force in nature. This ordeal has come; it will be gallantly met, and will be productive of lasting and beneficial results. It is interesting at this present juncture to point out the contrast between the British ideas of colonisation and of a colonial empire and those of Germany. Germany may be said to have hardly begun her colonial empire. She is founding and protecting commercial houses in various parts of the world, but the terrors of conscription and the duties of military service at home hang over her colonists and act as a deterrent force upon her large colonising population as a body. England has in past time exacted no compulsory military service from her struggling communities of pioneers and settlers. On the contrary she has fought

battles and expended large sums of money on their behalf, not once, but repeatedly. The fullest local autonomy has been conceded to every settlement that was fit for it, and its career of development has been uninterrupted. Now the colonists are strong and willing enough to return the compliment of help, and just as the services of one volunteer are worth those of a dozen pressed men, so the colonial corps at Suakim, although comparatively small, will be more valuable than larger bodies of unwilling conscripts dragged from across the seas to render burgher service.

Viewed in one sense this Suakim expedition may lead to the development of colonial and commercial extension. The tardy determination to lay down a permanent broad-gauge railway to Berber will bring Khartoum within easy distance of a base at the Red Sea. Khartoum, at the junction of the Blue and White Nile, must form an *entrepôt* for trade towards the equator past Gondokoro and on to the Lake country. The necessity therefore now forced by events upon the British nation, may lead them to take their legitimate and privileged position as pioneers of civilisation towards the equatorial regions of Africa. To hold Khartoum means therefore, not simply to strengthen our position on the Red Sea—a position which concerns our Pacific colonies as well as India most intimately—but also to secure the chief point in a commercial route. This route must in course of time be intersected by a line of commercial enterprise from the Congo on the West and Zanzibar on the East. The military necessity of temporarily occupying and providing afterwards, in Mr. Gladstone's words, for the orderly government of Khartoum, may become a commercial opportunity.

The mention of the Congo suggests the topic of the Berlin Conference, which appears, after prolonged sittings, to have completed its labours. The Congo Free State is at length launched into existence, and has a free outlet to the sea, together with a coast-line extending northwards for forty miles. The embarrassing and obstructive policy of Portugal threatened to render the proceedings of the Conference nugatory by asserting a claim to both sides of the Congo River at its mouth. Portuguese custom-houses would have checked all commercial activity had they been allowed to be erected here, but pressure was brought to bear upon the representatives of that effete rule, which has done nothing for civilisation during the last four centuries, and Portugal was compelled to yield. She still possesses large tracts of country adjacent to the "Free State" territory, and holds the south or left bank of the Congo as far as Nokki. Free trade, however, has a fair field, and England, as the great free-trading power of the world, should be satisfied. The fact of the Conference having been summoned at Berlin may be regarded by some as a slight, more or less intentional, upon her position, but it must be recollected that England has shown herself backward and listless in advancing, with any official sanction, the cause of commer-



cial enterprise in equatorial Africa. When she had the chance some years ago of obtaining Mr. Stanley's services, she refused to take them. Subsequently, the terms of the Anglo-Portuguese treaty proved how incapable our Ministers were of approaching the whole question of the Congo trade in a broad and statesmanlike manner. This treaty lies in the limbo of things forgotten, and is a record of an abortive attempt to settle in a temporary and shifting way a matter of permanent and international importance. Prince Bismarck must be credited in his Conference scheme with definite principles and a distinct programme. Difficulties have been thrown in the way, and rivalries excited in the delicate task of defining the nature and application of sovereignty rights, but they have been met and disposed of in a satisfactory manner. England has gained little addition to her territory; in fact, Liverpool merchants complain that their position at some points—for instance, Bolembó, in the Portuguese territory north of the Congo mouth—has been considered too little; but she has retained her hold upon the Lower Niger. She has gained in moral prestige by raising her voice against slavery, and pleading for the widest possible extension of the neutrality clauses, and her representatives, Sir E. Malet and Sir Travers Twiss, have proved themselves able exponents of international law. In fact, the conclusion of the whole Conference is, on the whole, favourable to England's traditional policy abroad. The greatest possible compliment was paid to her when the presidency of the Free State was by express consent reserved for an Englishman—the noble and chivalrous Gordon. It is bitter to reflect that the defender of Khartoum was never given the opportunity of enhancing the lustre of his wonderful career by the exercise of his administrative genius in so congenial a field as that afforded by the Congo Free State.

The interruption of telegraphic communication *via* Zanzibar and the East Coast of Africa has left us without recent news of affairs in Bechuanaland. *En passant*, the frequent break-down of this Eastern submarine cable might suggest the urgency of an alternative line by the West Coast of Africa. This latter line would be less liable to interception in case of war, and would, probably cost less in maintenance than the present one, which has the difficulties of coral reefs to contend with. According, however, to the latest news there has been a very satisfactory interview between Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Kruger, the President of the Transvaal. Our representative has been firm and decisive in his attitude; he has refused to listen to the claims of the freebooters, and his categorical answer to evasion is, "I will clear the country by force of arms." This decision has had its due weight, and there is an agreement between Sir Charles Warren and the Transvaal officials on essential points. Mr. Kruger must feel that the young Republic has outraged the principles of justice and right, and has therefore forfeited confidence in the eyes of the civilised world. But can he control his burghers? That is the

question; and the answer is anxiously expected by those who know how strong the anarchical and turbulent element of the Transvaal is. The Boers may make the cause of the freebooters their own. They still rely upon the prestige gained at Langenck and Majuba Hill, and feel assured of the sympathy of the Freestaters and a certain amount of co-operation in the Cape Colony itself. But will they be so rash as to precipitate a race quarrel and bring prominently forward the great and absorbing question as to whether British or Dutch are to guide the destinies of South Africa? The projects of Germany, which have not lost by interpretation, have created a little uneasiness in the breasts of the "Africander" party—in short, they begin to feel that if England really left them to themselves, and evacuated her position in South Africa as the paramount power, some other European nation would step in. Then it would be no plain sailing for the patriot party, who would always have the trying difficulty of the native question in their midst out of which strangers and aliens would not scruple to make capital. Boers like neither Germans nor French, and any sympathy between Pretoria and Paris or Berlin is of an exceedingly artificial kind. Weighing the matter well, Boers may endorse the truth of Sir Bartle Frere's remark, and agree with him that the little finger of a German bureaucracy may be heavier than the thigh of the British Colonial Office. Rumours are abroad that the Basutos are unsettled. The presence of the British forces has made the rebel chiefs, who have rendered a singularly meagre obedience to their Administrator, Colonel Clarke, wonder whether a demonstration will be made against themselves and the terms of the Disarmament Act of 1878 enforced. The Basutos, however, need not fear; their land is under direct Imperial control, and nothing would be done to irritate them needlessly. They are difficult to deal with; and their successful stand against the colonial forces in 1880—83 has increased their self-respect and given an impulse to their patriotism. It is not probable that England would go to the trouble of reconquering them. Their territory was the scene of one of the philanthropic enterprises of the late General Gordon, who, in a characteristic fashion, wished to exchange his post as Commandant-General of the Colonial forces, to which he was appointed by the Scanlen Government in 1882, for that of a simple Resident, with a salary of £300 a year, and take up his quarters with the most rebellious and pugnacious chief of all, Masupha by name, with a view of converting him to the ways of peace. The story of the treachery of a Cape official, Sauer by name, and the imminent dangers which the intrepid "Chinese" Gordon encountered, forms one of the most remarkable episodes of the Basuto wars.

The fact that Lord Rosebery has joined the Cabinet will be hailed by all those who have long wished to see a greater official sympathy with the Imperial, and especially the colonial position of England. Day by day the area of England's world-wide responsi-

bility seems to widen out. Her interests are affected in all those quarters where our European neighbours are exhibiting their new-born colonising crazes. There is especial need at the present moment for a vigilant Colonial Secretary who is firm in his dispatches to our European neighbours and sympathetic with our colonists. Mr. Cowen has lately expressed a doubt "whether the average British elector realised not only how our colossal possessions controlled domestic politics, but how largely they affected every-day life." Mr. George Potter has repeated very nearly the same idea in letters and speeches. He is convinced "that the people of England are not sufficiently alive to the importance to their welfare of a steady development of the resources of our colonies and dependencies." Lord Rosebery himself laid emphasis upon the supreme importance of the colonies to the working classes generally. Speaking at Aberdeen (September 12, 1884) to the delegates of the Trades Union Congress, he observed that the colonial question in its broadest sense was more important than the franchise, and for this reason, that the franchise question could take care of itself and this question could not. As an advocate, therefore, of the supreme importance of drawing closer the ties between England and her colonies he will be a popular member of the Cabinet. Mr. Cowen is severe upon those whom he terms "the latter-day exponents of an emasculated Benthamism." He observes that we are bound to them by the treble ties of race, religion, and interest, and, he might have added, of similar political institutions and the spirit of an identical civic freedom.

It is but  
the  
 Rosebery is not likely to be a disciple of this "emasculated Benthamism." At Epsom (February, 1884) he joined issue with Mr. Bright, who called those who were desirous of joining the colonies closer to us advocates of "a childish and absurd" doctrine. This expression, to use Lord Rosebery's own words, has rankled in his soul, and he proceeded to attack Mr. Bright's three arguments against empire and the growth of the imperial idea. For, Mr. Bright said, first of all, all empires have fallen, therefore ours must fall too. Secondly, he argued that our dependencies might be as other Irelands if we tried to govern them in a more formal and direct way. To this Lord Rosebery answered that his great reason for wishing to associate with our colonies more closely was that he was unwilling to be left alone with Ireland. Mr. Bright's third argument is founded on the difference that exists between the laws, especially those relating to commerce, of England and of her colonies. Still if England's colonists cannot be all of them freetraders at present, there are certain topics upon which they can agree. Apparently they are agreed upon the important question of Imperial defence, and the presence of Australian and Canadian volunteers in Egypt is the best evidence of this agreement.

*February 24, 1885.*









